European Commission

JRC SCIENTIFIC AND POLICY REPORTS

Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF)

Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF (STECF- OWP-12-05)

Edited by Michael W. Ebeling, Nikolaos Mitrakis & Hendrik Doerner

This report was reviewed by the STECF by written procedure in July 2012

Report EUR 25450 EN

Joint Research Centre

European Commission

Joint Research Centre

Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Contact information

STECF secretariat

Address: TP 051, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy

E-mail: stecf-secretariat@jrc.ec.europa.eu

Tel.: 0039 0332 789343

Fax: 0039 0332 789658

https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/home

http://ipsc.jrc.ec.europa.eu/

http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu/

JRC 73248

EUR 25450 EN

ISBN 978-92-79-25748-3

ISSN 1831-9424

doi:10.2788/39974

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2012

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR FISHERIES (STECF)

Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF (STECF-OWP-12-05)

JULY 2012

Background

The EWG 12-08 was held from 25-29 June in Hamburg, Germany. The EWG Chair, Michael Ebeling, presented an informative overview of the draft report to the STECF in plenum at the July 2012 plenary meeting.

Noting that the EWG 12-08 report was not yet finalised, STECF took the decision to withhold its opinion on the findings in the report.

The STECF Review and opinion was undertaken by correspondence and adopted by written procedure.

Request to the STECF

STECF is requested to review the report of the STECF Expert Working Group (EWG-12-08), evaluate the findings and make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

STECF observations

STECF appreciates the intensive and thorough work by EWG 12-08 in order to assist the Commission by reviewing the information from end users on data transmission in 2011 in comparison with the MS Annual Reports for 2011.

STECF acknowledges that the pre-screening of Annual Reports by ad-hoc contracted experts again worked very well and speeded up the process substantially. STECF notes that overall MS compliance with the DCF and National Programmes has been good. Even though it is now an obligation under the DCF, STECF also notes that some Member States failed to deliver sufficient information on data quality indicators. The EWG 12-08 report provides sufficient information to identify cases of non-compliance which the Commission can take up with Member States.

STECF observes that, in agreement with the Commission, EWG 12-08 has not addressed TOR 4 on the new Multi-Annual-Programme 2014-2020. However, as the new DCF will now be part of the overall MS structural funding scheme (EMFF and other funds) the new Multi-Annual-Programme will be part of the overall Programming Document. STECF acknowledges that the EU Commission has now sent a paper to the National Correspondents in Member States explaining the actual situation.

STECF notes that evaluation templates and AR guidelines need further revision. A list of relevant issues to be taken into consideration is given in chapter 10 of the EWG 12-08 report. The amendments need to be incorporated and distributed to National correspondents before the end of 2012.

STECF conclusions

STECF concludes that the review and cross-checking of information from end users on data transmission with the MS Annual Reports is currently inefficient. To streamline the process to make it more efficient, STECF stresses the need for a thorough quality check of the information from the end users: e.g. there are cases where submitted data which was rejected for use because of poor quality was reported in the same way as if no data have been submitted.

STECF concludes that in future with the development of a regional approach of the next DCF the review and cross-checking of information from end users on data transmission with the MS Annual Reports may best be carried out on a regional basis.

STECF concludes that the pre-screening undertaken by 6 experts prior to the meeting was very helpful in making the evaluation process more effective and efficient. However, given that there has not been any progress in developing an electronic pre-screening tool, STECF considers that further efforts to develop such a tool for the pre-screening of amendments to the 2011-13 National Programmes are not required as this will be the last program for the current DCF and the work can be undertaken by the EWG 12-19.

STECF notes that if EU Commission requests a review of data deficiencies and failures in future, clear guidelines for the report of data transmission failures need to be provided and thoroughly checked before dissemination.

STECF recommendations

STECF recommends the following:

That the AR guidelines and the AR evaluation templates are updated taking into account the proposals indicated in Chapter 10 of the EWG 12-08 Report . STECF proposes that this may best be achieved by adding this to the TOR of EWG 12-20 and EWG 12-13 (for aquaculture), and then STECF will adopt it by written procedure together with the response on the amendments of the NP in order that the update can be finished early in 2013. For this work the remarks and suggestion in chapter 10 of the EWG 12-08 report should be taken into account. The update should also take into account the amendment of some methodological issues as proposed in chapter 10 of EWG 12-08 report. The proposal for the AR evaluation templates concerning biological, transversal and fleet sections in Annex 5 of the EWG 12-08 should be used.

That pre-screening of annual reports be continued and that an electronic pre-screening tool be developed and tested before the first data submissions under the next DCF.

That the Commission disseminates the new guidelines as published in the EWG-12-08 report (http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/reports/dcf-dcr) for the submission of NP amendments as soon as possible.

REPORT TO THE STECF

EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON
Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF
(EWG-12-08)

Hamburg, Germany, 25-29 June 2012

This report does not necessarily reflect the view of the STECF and the European Commission and in no way anticipates the Commission's future policy in this area

“Only a fool learns from his own mistakes.
The wise man learns from the mistakes of others”

Otto von Bismarck

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG 12-08) on the Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF met at the VTI Institute of Sea Fisheries, Hamburg from 25th June to 29th June 2012. The terms of reference for the EWG are given in chapter 4.2. The expert group worked through a series of Sub Groups, presentations and plenary discussions. The main conclusions and recommendations from the meeting are given in the section that immediately follows this executive summary.

The European Commission considered this an important meeting in the DCF process as it evaluates Members States compliance with the DCF guidelines on submission of the Annual Reports. The Commission is relying on the outcome of this work for the assessment of DCF implementation in the 22 Member States carrying out fishing activities, to check for the correct implementation of EU policies and to assure a sustainable management of biological resources.

EWG 12-08 would like to acknowledge the work that has been carried out by Member States in compiling their 2011 Annual Reports.

Due to the positive feedback, a pre screening exercise was carried out again on the Annual Reports by 6 independent experts under an EU Commission contract. The pre screening was carried out on a country by country basis, while the fleet economic, the aquaculture and processing industry section was done by module. The pre-screening Group repeated its recommendation that a pre-screening exercise should be a regular feature of the review of the DCF Annual Reports. The view was that this can help to make the whole evaluation process of the Annual Reports more efficient and effective. Furthermore, the consistency of the evaluation process could be improved if one person evaluates one or more modules for all countries or at least a bundle of countries. This should be taken into consideration for the next year. A member of the pre-screening group presented the main results and conclusions to EWG 12-08.

EWG 12-08 view was that the pre screening exercise had been a very useful exercise again and that it had saved the group a considerable amount of time in the evaluations. There were some inconsistencies between pre screening evaluators and the results could have been available earlier. The pre screening process would benefit from the development of clear guidelines which would improve consistency between pre screening evaluators. Overall however, the exercise was again a success and EWG 12-08 recommended that it should be an integral part of the Annual Report evaluations (Addressing TOR 3).

EWG 12-08 also detected no progress on the pilot project to conduct an electronic pre screening of the Annual Reports (Addressing TOR 3). No progress seems to be done since last year, where the R script for the electronic pre-screening had been written but not been tested. The EU Commission was asked to establish a contract to test the tool and report to EWG 11-19. This has not happen. EWG 12-08 concludes that the Commission should consider establishing a contract to test the tool when the new DCF is established and that the results of this project should be available for the first AR evaluation meeting under the new DCF (Addressing TOR 3).

In order to conduct the evaluation of the Annual Reports at EWG 12-08, four Sub Groups were formed (Addressing TOR 1). As last year, these Sub Groups carried out the evaluations on a Module basis (i.e. not by country). In the past, SGRN has carried out the Annual Report evaluations on a country by country basis and this has caused major consistency problems for the Commission. Evaluation by modules removed this inconsistency to a large extent.

The first Sub Group dealt with the economic modules (Module IIIB, and IV), the second

Sub Group dealt with Modules I (General Framework), II (National Data Collection Organisations), IIIA (General description of the fishing sector), IIIC (Biological Mètier Related Variables), IIID (Recreational Fisheries). Sub Group 3 dealt with Modules IIIE (Stock Variables) and IIIF (Transversal Variables) while Sub Group 4 considered Module IIIG (Research Vessels), VI (Data Management), VII (Follow up STECF Recommendations). The remaining Modules (VIII, IX, X and XI) were considered well covered by the pre screening exercise.

In order to ensure consistency, the Sub Group chairs presented their groups evaluation results (by module) by addressing the following 6 questions (as in the previous year):

(1) Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations
(2) Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 21 MS, how many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?
(3) Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.
(4) Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?
(5) What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?
(6) What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them?
Provide recommendations.

In general EWG 12-08 found the evaluation form was very useful and it gives a good overview when evaluating the general, overall and section wise compliance of the annual reporting. Some confusion that occur in the last year exercise, as there were positive/negative YES/NO, could have been avoided by changing the wording in the evaluation form.

EWG 12-08 dedicated some effort to further improve the evaluation form and the AR guidelines. An extra Sub Group was comprised of SG 1-4 rapporteurs and the pre-screeners to work on this issue. The summarized results are given in chapter 10 of this report. The current state of the amendment of the AR template can be found in Annex 5. It needs further work during this year to complete updated evaluation forms and potential amendments of the AR guidelines. This may be done by EWG 12-13, EWG 12-15, EWG 12-20 and/or ad-hoc contracts with experts.

EWG 12-08 discussed this issue of data transmission against the background of the recent fines imposed on Member States for non conformity. The Group formed 3 Sub Groups, each dealing with 7 countries and an economist Sub Group dealing with the economic issues of all 21 countries. As the work was done as a pilot exercise, only remarks concerning possible improvement of such an exercise are summarized in chapter 7.

EWG 12-08 considered that the new Regional Data Bases would be a very important tool in determining data transmission and data quality issues in relation to ICES stock assessments. However, these data bases would not be fully operational until at least 2013. EWG 12-08 consider that the Regional Data Base will be a considerable help in data co-ordination issues. If the review on information from end-users should be repeated, EWG 12-08 sees the necessity of the provision of standardized, detailed and quality checked information on data transmission in advance of the evaluation procedure. EWG discussed that RCM´s may serve as a good body to do such a review.

EWG 12-08 is pleased to report to STECF that overall, the timelines in relation to the pre screening exercise were followed and that the exercise led to a more efficient and effective review of the DCR Annual Reports.

EWG 12-08 considered that DCF related STECF recommendations should be compiled and put on the JRC DCF website. ICES have already developed an ICES recommendation Data Base and the Liaison Meeting report already compiles the recommendations of the RCM's. Concerning approved derogations EWG 12-08 also considered to have central web storage of those in order to exercise a complete AR evaluation. EWG 12-08 acknowledges the provision of the last version of NP to the pre-screeners and EWG 12-08, as this was not the case the years before.

Addressing TOR 3a and 6, EWG 12-08 decided to not spend time on the development of a methodology for pre-screening of amendments to 2011-13 National Programmes and to provide a more general guideline in order to clarify if MS have to submit an amended NP and how to do so if necessary. It will be the last submission of NP amendments under the current DCF. After careful deliberation and comparing costs and benefits EWG 12-08 decided that this last evaluation procedure does not justify too much effort. EWG 12-08 agreed on criteria when changes in NP make it necessary to submit an updated NP to the EU Commission for revision by STECF.

Concerning TOR 4 and 5 no actions of EWG 12-08 were necessary.

The results of the EWG 12-08 review of Member States 2011 Annual Reports are given in the following table.

Module	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRC	GER	GRE[x]	IRL	ITA	LAT	LIT	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SLO	SPA	SWE	UK
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	P	P	M	M	M	M	M	Y		M	M	M	P	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Module I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		M	Y	**P**	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M
Module II	M	**P**	**P**	Y	M	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M
IIIA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	**P**	**P**	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IIIC	M	**P**	Y	M	M	M	M	Y		M	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	M	M	M	M
IIID	M	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	M	Y		M	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	**P**	NA	NA	Y	Y	M
IIIE	**P**	**P**	M	M	**P**	Y	M	M		M	M	M	**P**	**P**	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M	Y
IIIF	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y		Y	M	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	M
IIIG	Y	**P**	M	M	Y	M	M	Y		M	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	M	Y
Module Vmodule VI	M	M	**P**	Y	**P**	M	Y	Y		Y	M	M	**P**	**P**	Y	**P**	**P**	M	**P**	M	Y	M
III B (Fleet Econ.)	M	**P**	M	Y	M	M	M	Y		M	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	M	M	M	M
Module IV Aqua	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y		Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	Y
Module IV B (Processing)	**P**	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y		Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	M
Module VII	**P**	N	**P**	N	**P**	Y	M	Y		Y	Y	**P**	**P**	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	**P**

x Note that Greece has not provided an Annual Report

Compliance level	
No <10%	N
Partly 10-50%	**P**
Mostly 50-90%	M
Yes >90%	Y
NA = not applicable	**NA**

2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP

Conclusion on TOR 1

Many of the answers provided by the pre-evaluators were in agreement with the subgroup evaluations. EWG 12-08 observed that evaluation templates and AR guidelines need further amendments. These revisions should be done before the end of 2012. A list of relevant issues to be taken into consideration is given in chapter 10 of this report. EWG 12-08 further observes that even if endorsed by STECF, recommendations of EWG 11-08 were not really complied by concrete responses at the EU level (e.g. list of approved derogation, List of relevant STECF recommendations).
EWG 12-08 also observes that some MS do not justify deviations or shortfalls compared to their National Programmes by simply ignoring the obligation to do so.
EWG 12-08 further observes that MS are enforced to use data from the Structural Business Statistics in particular for processing industry data. SBS legislation does not allow the publication of CV or sampling rates. This should be taken into account by simply waive the obligation of reporting further data quality indicators if SBS as data source is used. A short description in the NP of the data collection methodology from the SBS quality report shall be sufficient then.

Conclusions on TOR 2

EWG 12-08 concluded that the review of information from end users on data transmission in comparison with the MS Annual Reports shall be better prepared, in particular a thorough quality check of the information from the end users is necessary: e.g. submission of data but their rejection for use is currently reported in the same way as if those data have not been submitted. Having in mind the regionalisation approach of the new DCF, this review may be done on a RCM level in the future.

Conclusions on TOR 3

EWG 12-08 concluded the pre-screening to be very helpful and making the evaluation process more effective and efficient. To the knowledge of the group, there has not been any progress in developing an electronic pre-screening tool.

Effort should not been wasted in order to develop a one-time applied methodology for pre-screening of amendments to 2011-13 National Programmes.

Conclusions on TOR 4

The EU Commission informed the group about a new paper that has been sent to the National Correspondents. In agreement with the Commission, EWG-12-08 concluded that there is no development that needs further action of the group.

Conclusions on TOR 5

After having considered the comments, remarks and recommendation of STECF 12-01, EWG 12-08 concluded that there is no further follow-up action to be undertaken.

Conclusions on TOR 6

Analogue to TOR 3b, EWG 12-08 concluded to not spend too much effort to review the Guidelines for the 2013 revision of the NP2011-2013, as it will be the last NP amendment under the old DCF. The group focused on criterion when NP amendments have to be submitted for evaluation. See chapter 9 of this report.

In general EWG 12-08 has identified the following Member states as providing very thorough and Benchmark examples of various modules presented in their respective Annual Reports.

Table 1: Benchmark examples by module

Module	Country
I (General Framework)	Belgium, Poland
II (National data Collection Organisation)	Denmark, Netherlands
III	
IIIA (Description of the Fishing Sector)	Netherlands, Portugal, UK
IIIB (Economic Variables)	
IIIC (Biological Métier Related Variables)	Sweden, Germany, Cyprus
IIID (Recreational Fisheries)	Denmark, Finland
IIIE (Biological Stock Related Variables)	UK
IIIF (Transversal Variables)	Netherlands
IIIG (Research Vessels at sea)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands
IV (Economics – Aquaculture and Processing)	Germany, Latvia
V (Ecosystem Indicators)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands
VI (Management of Data)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands

3 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP

The following recommendations are agreed on by the EWG 12-08

TOR 1

1. AR guidelines and AR evaluation templates update	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends an update of the AR guidelines and of the AR evaluation templates. This work may be assisted by some EWG, but cannot fully be done by them. EU Commission is asked to provide ad hoc contracts for this so that the update can be finished at the end of the year. For this work the remarks and suggestion in chapter 10 of this report are strongly recommended to be taken into account. This includes some methodological issues to be considered as well. Concerning the AR guidelines, a proposal for the biological, transversal and fleet economic section is provided in Annex V and shall be used.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Ad-hoc contract and/or EWG.
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	During 2012

TOR 2

2. Data transmission failures assessment	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends that if it would be necessary and requested by the EU Commission, to repeat the review of data deficiencies and failures, then it shall be done at a regional level. Before this could be exercised, a clear and consistent guideline for the report of data transmission failures has to be provided and thoroughly checked before disseminated
Follow Up Action Needed :	Decision on which body should cover the assessment.
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	Before new Assessment of data transmission failures

TOR 3

3. Installation of a regular pre-screening group for AR evaluation	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends to install the pre-screening as a regular tool for AR evaluation
Follow Up Action Needed :	Decision to install pre-screening group on a regular basis
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	Before new AR evaluation 2013

4. Electronic pre-screening tool	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends the test of an electronic pre-screening tool timely before the submission of the first AR under the new DCF, in order to decide if it can be applied or if it needs further development.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Ad-hoc contract
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	Before new AR evaluation 2015

5. No pre-screening for NP amendment in 2012, no pre-screening guidelines	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends neither to develop guidelines for the pre-screening of submitted 2013 NP amendments nor to undertake a pre-screening exercise. It will be the last submission under the old DCF and it is expected with high probability that the work can be covered by EWG 12-19.
Follow Up Action Needed :	Decision
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG Mare
Time Frame	Before evaluation of amended NP in December 2012

TOR 4

None

TOR 5

None

TOR 6

6. New guidelines for submission of NP 2013 amendments in 2012	
EWG 12-08 Recommendation :	EWG 12-08 recommends to disseminate the new guidelines for the submission of NP amendments as soon as possible..
Follow Up Action Needed :	Mailing/dissemination
Responsible For Follow Up Action :	DG MARE
Time Frame	As soon as possible

4 INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCES

4.1 Introduction

The STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) on Evaluation of the 2011 DCF Annual Reports (EWG 12-08) met at the VTI Institute of Sea Fisheries, Hamburg from 25th June to 29th June 2012. The terms of reference for the EWG are given in chapter 4.2. The expert group worked through a series of Sub Groups, presentations and plenary discussions. EWG 12-08 also had the results of a "pre screening exercise" conducted on the Annual Reports by a panel of 6 independent experts.

Participants

The list of participants is given below. The contact details are given in Annex VI.

Opening remarks by the Commission

The Commission considers this an important meeting in the DCF process as it evaluates Members States compliance with the DCF guidelines on submission of the Annual Reports. The meeting of the expert working group analysing the annual reports 2011 of 21 Member States is a crucial part of the evaluation process of the EU data collection framework (DCF). The pre-screening that has been carried out by a small group for the second time this year should allow for an even better structuring and streamlining of the work. The Commission is relying on the outcome of the work of the group for the assessment of DCF implementation in the 21 Member States carrying out fishing activities to check for the correct implementation of EU policies and to assure a sustainable management of biological resources.

Pre-Screening

A pre screening exercise was conducted on the Annual Reports by a group of 6 independent experts who worked by correspondence over a 10 day period in June. The pre screening group used the evaluation template developed by EWG 11-02 and adapted it by considering the remarks of EWG 11-08 and STECF 12-01 (see Annex III). The final pre screening files for each country were available on time for the EWG 12-08 meeting. A more detailed description of the pre screening is given in Section 5 of this report.

4.2 Terms of Reference for EWG-12-08

1. Evaluate Member States Annual Reports for 2011 in accordance with Article 7.2 of Council Regulation (EC) No 199/2008, taking into account;
    a. The execution of the National Programmes for 2011
    b. The quality of the data collected by the Member States
    c. Information from end users on data transmission in 2011 (covered by ToR 2 in greater detail)

2. Review information from end users on data transmission in 2011 in comparison with the MS Annual Reports for 2011. This TOR will require experts to review the apparent data transmission failures and deficiencies in delivered data identified by end-users in order to allow the Commission to enforce MS obligations in a clear and transparent manner. The review may be based on the template and procedure developed by SGRN 10-02, for reporting data deficiencies by data user groups (STECF, ICES, ICCAT, GFCM and other RFMOs or international scientific bodies). Particular attention will be paid to:

    a. Response by MS to calls for data launched by the Commission in order to feed into scientific advice provided by STECF:

    - Aquaculture data call,

    - Processing data call,

    - Annual Effort data call,

    - Fleet economic data call.

    b. Data transmission to end-users in 2012 with a focus on feedback on data availability, quality, gaps and the data used in the scientific advisory process provided by ICES and, if such feedback is received before the meeting, from relevant RFMOs;

3. a) Evaluate 2012 manual pre-screening of the MS Annual Reports for 2011 and also any progress made with the project for the electronic pre-screening of the annual reports.
    b) Agree on next steps to develop a methodology for pre-screening of amendments to 2011-13 National Programmes (to feed into EWG12-20 in December 2012).

4. New EU Multi Annual Programme 2014-2020

5. Review the comments made by STECF at the Spring Plenary (April 2012).

6. Review the Guidelines for the 2013 revision of the NP2011-2013.

5 EVALUATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORTS – THE PRE-SCREENING EXERCISE

The pre-screening group made the following remarks:

In general, we want to highlight the well better quality of the technical tables and AR texts provided by MS. As the group pre-screened AR already last year, improvements are substantial: splitting by regions, by surveys, text and comments, that were missing last year, have been provided this year. CVs estimates are provided even if precision targets are not achieved.

The group appreciates the improvement of the evaluation template and made pre-screening more efficient (CVs, positive/negative questions).

The provision of the last version of NP 2011-2013 agreed by DG Mare is an effective plus. Evaluators can assume that what is written in the last version is in fact accepted by DG Mare. So last NPs versions became the references for pre-screening and all derogations requested by MS can be considered as granted by EU.

- In case of imputed value of unpaid labour, imputation means that no response rate is meaningful. If it is based on surveys it may be reworded into estimated value of unpaid labour. It should be clarified if a pure imputation or a estimation on a survey basis is expected here.

- Cyprus still mentions problems of defining processing. This has been clarified by a EWG already and should be used by Cyprus.

- Concerning the CV, the following may be taken into consideration:
  (Guidelines, page 11 f.)

  A formula to calculate CV is given:

  $CV(\hat{Y}) = \sigma(\hat{Y})/\hat{Y}$

  where:

  $\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})$ is the estimate standard deviation of $\hat{Y}$
  $\hat{Y}$ is the estimated total value (per fleet segment) of the variable e.g. total energy costs

  When only a sample of data from a population is available, the population CV can be estimated using the ratio of the <u>sample standard deviation</u> s to the sample mean $\bar{x}$:

$$\hat{c}_v = \frac{s}{\bar{x}}$$

But this estimator, when applied to a small or moderately sized sample, tends to be too low: it is a biased estimator. For normally distributed data, an unbiased estimator for a sample of size n is:

$$\hat{c}_v^* = \left(1 + \frac{1}{4n}\right)\hat{c}_v$$

- Romania and Ireland raised up the problem with voluntary response to surveys and that data quality could be improved if respondents would have the obligation to deliver the requested data.

- MS are asked to provide CV for a bundle of variables In case of the processing industry data from SBS shall be used. Then the following problem with accuracy and reliability concerning the SBS occurs:

  :

  "The SBS Regulation is an output-oriented Regulation, leaving data providers the choice of data sources. In most countries a combination of survey and administrative data is used. It is very hard to assess the accuracy of the administrative data. No quantitative indicator is available."

  "For the data covered by survey the coefficients of variation have to be transmitted. Work is ongoing to calculate an overall EU coefficient of variation, but this is not available yet. **Data of individual countries cannot be published**."

  "The unit non-response and item non-response are provided by EEA Member States, but cannot be disseminated."

  (Source: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/sbs_esms.htm)

- If MS uses SBS, a description should be provided in their NP, based on the quality report of the National Statistical Office. This should include the collection scheme (Census/Probability sampling/stratified sampling/etc.), information about sampling and non-sampling errors etc. MS should be aware that mostly SBS is not a Census.

- Concerning Table IV.A.2 and IV.B.1:

  P in row J is a mistake. According to the guidelines text, division for archieved sample has to be made by frame population, and not by P (planned sample number).

- Filling up Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 is a little bit confusing:

III.C.5 deals with planned species to be sampled referring to NP, while table III.C.6 resumes all the length sampling results by métier carried out by MS, especially when applying the concurrent sampling method. This method can provide data on extra-planned species. Is it useful to report these extra species in III.C.5? We do not think so and so we propose that extra (not planned) species are to be reported only in III.C.6, except if complementary data (as CVs) can be provided.

- Some kind of version history for the text and table files was found to be helpful (example: Belgium). We propose to have for some sections more historical or complete overviews. Especially for surveys (III.G). Some MS give only very brief information. The information should be the more the more costly a module is. Detailed data on operations carried out of main fishing targets would be welcome.

- It is time to better specify what are the targets to achieve for sections V an VI. Some MS provide regular (but a minima or without interest) information, as others detailed what was effectively the progress made during the AR reference year.

- Recommendations of the EWGs having evaluated former year AR shall be included in the following AR. It is not the case for several MS, so pre-screeners met problems for example to identify what were the 2011 achievements because years 2011, 2012 and 2013 were there in.

- Formats of some data to be provided should be worthy defined: % or 0.00 or 00.00 for example for achievements registered. It would be relevant when applying automatic checking, even with Excel.

- We can deplore that recommendations of last year EWG-11-08, even when endorsed by STECF, were not really complied by concrete responses at the EU level (Provision of reference list of derogations, STECF recommendations list, etc...).

- If sampling frame codes are being used in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, these should also be referred to in the text (example: In the Polish AR Table III.C.4, only sampling frame codes were used, while the text only refers to métier codes, and back-and-forth checking with Table III.C.3 - containing both métier and sampling frame codes - was necessary for evaluation.)

- There still are redundant standard tables or at least redundant columns, such as (species lists within) Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6, and referring to age sampling in Table III.C.5 is highly confusing (cf. NL report). Instead, tables in section III.E should list how many individuals per stock were measured for length, age, individual weight, sex, maturity (and fecundity).

- In Table VI.1 (data transmission), a column for Aquaculture economic data must be added.

List of comments frequently used in the prescreening of Economic variables:

- Names of segments and supra regions should be those stated in the regulation.
- Clustered segments should be signaled by an asterisk in table III.B.1
- Achieved sample rate is not appropriate for census, response rate should be given instead.
- Clustered segment should take the name of the largest segment in the cluster
- When response rate of census <70% other variability indicators should be provided in addition to CV.
- CV value cannot be the same for all variables
- Capital value, capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in this table. Transversal variables have to be shown in table III.F.1
- Variables were not provided in NP and therefore cannot be compared
- No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines.

6 EVALUATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORTS BY EWG 12-08

Please be aware that the following section only presents the reports of the sub-groups. As far as there are relevant for the AR guidelines, the AR templates or in general, remarks and comment are summarized and edited in chapter 10. Agreed recommendations and conclusion are presented in Chapter 2 and 3.

The work was organized in 4 Sub-groups, each assigned with specific modules according the following schedule:

Sub Group 1

Module IIIB (Economic Variables)

Module IV (Economics Aquaculture, Processing industry)

Sub Group 2

Module I (General Framework)

Module II (National Data Collection Organisations)

Module IIIA (General description of the fishing sector)

Module IIIC (Biological Métier Related Variables)

Module IIID (Recreational Fisheries)

Sun Group 3

Module IIIE (Biological Stock Related Variables)

Module IIIF (Transversal Variables)

Sub Group 4

Module IIIG (Research Surveys at Sea)

Module V (Effects of Fishing on Ecosystems)

Module VI (Management and Use of Data)

Module VII (Follow up STECF Recommendations)

Remark: Module VIII to Module XI were evaluated by the pre screening exercise and not considered any further by EWG 12-08.

Sub-Groups were assembled by assuring regional expertise. As a guideline, the following six questions were given to the Sub-Groups.

Questions to be addressed:

1. Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 20 MS, how many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

6. What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them?. Provide recommendations.

The results of the Sub-Group work are given in the next section. Before some general remarks that came up during the evaluation performance are summarized:

General comments:

Economic variables

- Concerning table III.B.2 (economic clustering of fleet segments), Member States (MSs) are reminded that this table should contain information on *clustered* segments.
- Concerning table III.B.3 (economic data collection strategy), MSs should note that in the case that a variable is not applicable in a MS (e.g. income from fishing rights) it should not be left blank, but marked as '*NA*' in the table.

Biological métier-related variables/ Biological stock-related variables

- MSs should ensure that 'Sampling frame codes' in in table III.C.3 (expected sampled trips by métier) and III.C.4 (métier sampling strategy) correspond.
- The planned number of trips/individuals provided in the National Programme and Annual Report tables (identical columns) deviated in several cases. MSs are invited to ensure these data match.
- The Group recognized that at EU and regional levels considerable effort has been put into harmonizing the definitions, naming and coding of métiers, fishing grounds, regions as well as species in accordance with Commission decision 93/2010. Nevertheless, further efforts in this regard will be required.

For example, CECAF, IOTC, ICCAT etc. should be reported as 'Other Regions' (refer to Appendix II of Commission decision 93/2010) and then the different RFMOs and fishing ground should be specified in the relevant columns. Further, the working group recommends always using the scientific species names in the Annual Report text.

Transversal variables

- It appeared that several MSs did not follow Annual Report guidelines for completing table III.F.1 (transversal variables data collection strategy). In some cases table III.F.1 was left blank entirely, or cells read '*NA*' for censuses. Table III.F.1 should be completed, also for censuses.

Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

- Concerning table IV.A.1 (general overview of aquaculture activities), MSs should specify farmed species.

Collection of Economic data, aquaculture and fleet

- If numbers of population segments in tables III.B.1 (population segments for collection of economic data), IV. A.2 (population segments for collection of aquaculture data) and table IV.B.1 (processing industry: population segments for collection of economic data) have been updated, MSs are asked to mention this in their Annual Report.

General issues

- In general, MSs' effort in complying with CVs reporting requirements has increased. However, some MS have not calculated CVs for any or some of the parameters using the explanation that the tool for calculating CV, COST (Common Open Source Tool), is not fully developed. This explanation is not considered valid as the requirement to estimate and report CV is clearly stated in the regulation.

  Further, the methodology used for the assessment of quality of data collected should be described in the Annual Report.

Sub-Group 1

1. Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

Helpful in general. A list of "frequently applied comments" would be helpful for standardization.

2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 20 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

See overview table

General remarks:

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

See extra document on general comments.

5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Only for module IV: Germany and Latvia.

6. What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them ?.

Provide recommendations.

Ranking scheme not always applicable (in terms of percentages). Questions are sometimes ambiguous, sometimes overlapping.

E.g.: >Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

>Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?

Sometimes we find "mistakes", but they are not declared as "deviations". In these cases we would always have to state "deviations are not justified" – that makes little sense. Same with "actions to avoid shortfalls in the future" : the errors that we find are usually not mentioned by the MS.

LM/RCM usually never refers to the economic part, we never have anything to fill in here.

The evaluation template does basically refer to the tables, but does not directly address the AR text. The pre-screening template should also refer to information which is requested by the guidelines and has to be provided in the text. It would in general be helpful to have the template set up more like an exhaustive checklist of variables and information which has to be provided in either the text or the tables.

General issues observed during the evaluation

IIIB1 –it should be clear that this table contains information on clustered segments. Information on clustering and on unclustered segments will be provided in table IIIB2. This should be clarified in both the NP guidelines and the AR guidelines.

The footnote on „capital value“ in IIIB3 should also be contained in the guideline text.

The guideline text should provide an overview on which variables are supposed to be included in table IIIB3 and which not

The National Program should contain an estimate of the number of vessels using the latest information available at the time of submission. MS should have a straightforward option to update these numbers without the obligation to go through the evaluation procedure.

The calculation of CV appears to be unclear. It is strongly recommended to update the AR guidelines in this context (-> finite population correction).

Clarification that CV is not useful for debt/asset ratio or derived variables

Guidelines chapter IIIB2: request for CV of observed values in case of non-probability sampling and census with response rate < 70% does not make much sense, as it does not give additional information as compared with CV of total estimates. The major concern in context of non-probability sampling and low response census is bias, and bias is not indicated by the CV of observed values. To be reviewed.

In the guidelines it is stated:

In case of derived indicators, as FTE, MS should provide the information about calculation procedures and accuracy indicators of based data collected. The data collected for this purpose should be stated in the report and accuracy indicators should be presented in Table III.B.3.

This paragraph should be clarified by a list of the derived indicators for which the calculation procedure is requested and a table providing a complete list of “based data” items and accuracy indicators of based data that should be presented. Moreover, this extra information should be provided in the AR text and not in the tables as DCF variables are already in the table and non DCF data should not be presented in the tables in any way.

Requirements for the justification of clustering are unclear. NP tables contain indication of segment characteristics in terms of importance and similarity, but AR tables do not. On the other hand, AR text guidelines states:

“Clustering of fleet segments should be described and information should be given on the segments that are clustered, as required by the DCF and following STECF recommendations.”

It is not consistent to request some indicator of importance in the NP and to request clustering information in the AR again. Instead, AR should request further information on clustering only in the case that the clustering scheme has changed compared to the NP.

Concerning achieved sample rate in tables IIIB1 and IIIB3, table IIIB3 contains comprehensive information on sample and response rates by segment and variable while Table IIIB1 contains only

one value per fleet segment. In case of different sampling schemes within a segment it is unclear which sample and response rates have to be provided in table IIIB1. E.g. income from landings is often derived from landings declarations which are available exhaustively, i.e. the sampling scheme is census while for the same fleet segment a questionnaire might be used to get cost data, and therefore the sampling scheme should be probability sampling. The latter sampling approach will have lower achieved sampling and response rates.

The AR guidelines should be amended with respect to this issue. A solution might be to use a separate line for each sampling scheme per segment in table IIIB1.

Footnote a) in table IIIB3 is misleading because it excludes all variables from the capital value variable group. It should not exclude the value of quota and other fishing rights as these are not determined by the PIM method.

Many MS are using SBS, particularly for fish processing. In this case, information on data quality should not be mandatory to be provided (as it is defined under SBS legislation).

In the case that a variable is not applicable in a MS (e.g. income from fishing rights), it should not be left blank, but marked as “NA” in table IIIB3.

Some MS provided both achieved sample rate and response rate in case of a census, some did not. According to the AR guidelines, it does not have to be provided. Both versions make sense. For harmonisaton purposes it should be explicitly stated in the guidelines which version should be provided.

Sub-Group 2

1. Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful ? was it

thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

Yes, the pre-screening was very helpful and sufficiently thorough. A few improvements in terms of consistency are necessary:

a) Evaluators should all have the same understanding for answering the questions in the evaluation sheets, e.g. in the sections on regional co-ordination, the answer to the question "*Were the relevant derogations listed?*" should be "NA" (not applicable) if there are no relevant derogations at all (instead of "No"). See recommendation 1 in STECF EWG 11-08 report on the need for guidelines for evaluators.

b) In the comments cells, formulations such as "*MS should revise…*" should be avoided (only in case of unclear wording by MS in the AR text or tables), and instead, only facts about outstanding or erroneous information be stated. It is up to STECF to recommend MS amendments and up to the Commission to decide upon forwarding these recommendations to MS.

2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 20

MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

Yes:

Mostly:

Partly:

No:

See overview table

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS.

How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

a) Codes for sampling frames should match exactly in Table III.C.3 and III.C.4.
b) Table III.C.5 should only report on length information, not age.
c) The planned number of trips/individuals provided in the NP and AR tables (identical columns) deviated in several cases, which should not be the case.
d) RCM recommendations 2011 relevant for AR 2011 (responsive actions could not cover whole year)?

4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How

would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

a) After some initial joint assessment of 1-2 MS within the whole sub-group, dividing the group into pairs of or individual evaluators, assessing 4-5 MS each, proved to be an efficient working procedure.
b) The overview table on MS performance should be constructed by region.
c) Where does the NAFO area belong in terms of AR reporting?
d) Should "Other regions" be more specified by RFMOs, fishing grounds etc. in the AR text and tables?

5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

I (General framework): Belgium, Poland

II (National organisation, regional co-ordination): Denmark, Netherlands

III.A (General description of the fishing sector): Netherlands, Portugal, UK

III.C (Biological métier related variables): Sweden, Germany, Cyprus

III.D (Recreational fisheries): Denmark, Finland

6. What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them?

Provide recommendations.

a) Suggest question for section I: *Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?*

Sub-Group 3

1. Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful? Was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations

The pre – screening of DCF Annual Reports is a very useful exercise, and does allow for a more efficient final screening at the EWG. There is of course room for improvement. Some of the major issues encountered were as follows:

1. There are still some inconsistencies with the pre – screening process. For example, one biological pre – screener also evaluated the transversal variables, even though the transversal variables were evaluated by the economic subgroup. This resulted in two evaluations being produced for module F for a number of Member States. This led to confusion amongst the subgroup.
   - It is recommended that the pre – screening group, have an initial meeting (via WebEx) to agree a consistent approach to these issues.
   - We also recommend that the evaluation template be updated as necessary at the EWG meeting and the final agreed template included as an annex in the EWG 12-08 report, and also circulated to MS for their information.
   - It is also recommended that a brief guideline be written during the EWG meeting for the pre – screeners, in order to ensure consistency across the evaluations.

2. Reporting in the template should be completed in a consistent fashion. Not all the transversal variable prescreening cells were filled out. Pre – screeners are requested to ensure that the pre – screening template is complete for all Member States.

3. During the evaluation process there was some confusion over some of the pre – screening answers. This was particularly evident on the following question in module III.E.

Question: Were the relevant derogations listed?

The EWG recommends that there should be a standardised answer and understanding of the answer, as follows:

Answer: No - Should be taken to mean that derogations were requested in the NP, but are not present in the AR

Answer: NA – Should be taken to mean that no derogations were requested in the NP.

4. Regions in biological modules C and E in the template should reflect the separation of regions in the Annual Report, and be assessed separately to allow for a thorough evaluation.

2. Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 21 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?

The overall standard of AR text and tables has improved substantially for modules E and F

Module	Yes (3)	Mostly (13)	Partly (5)	No
Module III.E	Slovenia, Finland, UK	Italy, Portugal, Denmark, France, Romania, Ireland, Latvia, Poland, Sweden, Netherlands, Cyprus, Spain, Germany.	Malta, Belgium, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Estonia.	
	Yes (12)	Mostly (8)	Partly	No (1)
Module III.F	Malta,Portugal, Slovenia,Denmark, Finland, Bulgaria, Romania, Ireland, Poland, Sweden, Netherlands, Germany	Italy, Belgium, France, Latvia, UK, Cyprus, Lithuania, Estonia.		Spain

3. Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.

Calculation and Reporting of CV's

One of the most common issues across all member states was the recurring question of the calculation and reporting of CV's.

Reviewing all MS programs concerning the calculation of CV on the stock related parameters, the following can be concluded and highlighted:

The present requirements (i.e. reporting of the CV values) have resulted in some problems. CV are to be reported for variables that are not been asked for by main end-users, MS have difficulties in reporting CV and It is universally agreed that the current precision levels are unrealistic and irrelevant, as they are only used for the DCF Annual Report. The end users of the data should be consulted during the review process currently underway for the new framework, on what would be their preferred options regarding the evaluation of data quality.

In general, the effort input by MS in calculating CVs has increased. However, some MS have not calculated CV for any or some of the parameters using the explanation that the tool for calculating CV, COST (Common Open Source Tool), is not fully developed. This explanation is not considered valid, while the requirement to estimate and report CV is clearly stated in the regulation. The methodology used for calculation of CV has to be described in the Annual Report, but only a few MS have included a description. In order to be able to evaluate the relevance of the actual CV values a description of method used must be included.

The COST project was intended to be the tool for managing the CV calculation for all parameters, to be used by all MS. Since the project ended, no support, no further development or remaining bugs have been corrected which makes the tool incomplete. This has of course, caused some problems for several MS, while other MS have started to develop separate scripts for the CV calculation.

The EWG recommends that new methods of reporting quality indicators for sampling programmes are adopted in the new framework.

Evaluation of the quality of the data – inclusion of alternative quality indicators

It is further important to realize that CVs is not a "standalone" indicator of data quality. Even if data is precise it could be corrupted by bias. To be able to estimate CVs in a correct way, statistically sound sampling schemes need to be designed. The quality assurance of designs including establishment of methods for representative sampling, requirements for documentation and development of quality indicators should be the priority. WKPICS 1-3 will be dealing with the design of statistically sound sampling designs and should be considered as a good reference for the formation of sampling guidelines in the new framework.

Such schemes could be evaluated by the STECF-EWG and constitute an indicator of quality. In such schemes it needs to be evaluated what part of the population is accessible for sampling (which could be another indicator) and if the parts not accessible differ, from the sampled population, in for example, spatial fishing pattern (which could be another indicator). Age readings are another element which can also introduce bias. It is therefore important that MS on a routine basis, work with quality assurance and that new staff get sufficient training before starting age reading on a routine basis. Existence of protocols (that could be evaluated by STECF-EWG) on quality control and follow up for age readings within a MS could be a quality indicator as well as percentage agreement in the actual age readings. EWG 12 – 08 believes the quality aspects would improve considerably if alternative quality indicators were considered in the new DCF.

4. Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?

Specific issues encountered:

1. concerning module F – transversal variables – it appeared that several MS did not appreciate the guidance in the Regulation. Table IIIF1 was left blank or each cell had " not relevant" or 'NA' when the MS considered their sampling achieved 100%. Table IIIF1 should be completed.
2. MS should not plan sampling at a level submitted in their NP then change that planned number in the AR without agreement.

5. What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?

Good examples

- module E – UK
- module F - Netherlands

6. What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them?

Provide recommendations.

The evaluation forms have improved since last year because the questions have been re-worded: a positive answer now reflects a positive outcome, and vice versa.

- The Group recognized that at EU and Regional level has been put considerable effort in harmonising naming and definitions of métiers as well as Region and fishing grounds, in accordance with Decision 949/2008 EC and the following 93/2010.

Thereafter, the Group recommends all MS, in order to check discrepancies between texts and technical tables' samples, to ensure unambiguous documenting and coding of gears, métiers, fishing grounds etc… and to avoid fastidious and time consuming validation before tables' analysis, to follow strictly the Guidelines in terms of coding, naming conventions of métiers, regions, fishing grounds and species.

In the tables, CECAF, IOTC ICCAT etc. should be reported as "Other Regions" (see Appendix II EU Dec 93/2010) and then the different RFMO (i.e. CECAF, IOTC, WCPCF etc.) and fishing ground should be specified. The same structure should be presented and reported in the text. Text and tables of the Annual Report must be comparable and must correspond!!

Moreover, the Group recommends to use in the text the scientific names of the species (do not use the local name of the species!!!) in order to ensure homogeneity between countries and Region!!!

- No cells should be deleted from the table and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR.

Sub-Group 4

1. ***Overall comments on the pre screening exercise – was it helpful? was it thorough? How could it be improved – Provide Recommendations***
   - The pre-screening was useful. However, it is important to even evaluate 'Yes' scores as the pre-screener might have overlooked specific issues. But it is always easier to go through information supplied than to generate the information yourself.
   - Degree of pre-screening varied. Some were very extensive, other were less detailed.

   Recommendation: Provide guidelines or suggestions for pre-screeners. Encourage comments from the pre-screening, as it helps in the final evaluation.

2. ***Overall performance of Member States on your Modules. Overview - of the 20 MS, How many were YES, Mostly, Partially, NO?***

   See overview table with final scores.

3. ***Overall what were the four major issues that arose in your evaluation across MS. How would you resolve these? – Provide recommendations.***
   - Identification of shortfalls:
     - MS sometimes do not address apparent shortfalls. How to evaluate? Against the MS opinion or against the opinion of the experts? This group chose for the latter option.
     - it is sometimes hard to identify shortfalls without specific information on the country's sampling
   - Comparison of achievements vs. NP for table VI_1 is difficult as most countries do not complete this table in the NP.
   - Relevant recommendations for MS to address: Now there is no overview of RCM/LM recommendations and it is difficult to evaluate.

Recommendation: It is recommended that all countries list all RCM/LM recommendations that are put to MS. Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

- Follow-up of STECF recommendations: not all member states used the format given in the template.

  Recommendation: Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

4. ***Any specific issues (max 4) that arose that you would like to highlight. How would you resolve these? Provide recommendations?***
   - For Table V_1 the template states 'for indicators 1-4 see III_G_1', but this table does not supply any information about the time lag for the data availability. This leads to inconsistency in the reported tables, as some MS incorporate indicators 1-4 in table V_1 and others don't.

     Recommendation: let all indicators be listed in table V_1.
   - Data deficiencies: No MS was able to transmit all required data to ICES/JRC. The evaluation was only performed in relation to the data transmissions described in NP and the data transmission compliance reports from JRC/ICES have not been considered. Evaluation of achievements vs. NP for table VI_1 is difficult as most countries do not complete this table in NP. The level of detail of the ICES/JRC reports is less than provided by the assessment WG's, so no background is provided (e.g., too short time-series, incomplete datasets).

     Note: The evaluation is only done in relation to the NP data transmissions described.
   - Review of STECF/LM recommendations:
     - Difficult to judge: no complete list of recommendations to evaluate against.
     - Review of recommendations: MS should state explicitly if there are no relevant recommendations to address.
     - III.G.3 recommendations: there were no 2010 survey recommendations except for the RGM Med&BS

     Recommendation: Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

5. ***What MS would you cite as good examples of how to complete these modules?***
   - Germany, Ireland, Netherlands

6. ***What did you think of the evaluation forms? How would you improve them? Provide recommendations.***
   - Question in module VI "Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?" not always appropriate or relevant. For example, MS with no text on specific data management targets will be scored NA, whereas MS with text in NP proposal will be evaluated.

     Recommendation: in NP review clearly let targets be defined.
   - List of STECF recommendations is required, but was not available. Only the listed recommendations have been evaluated. Problem will be solved with database.
   - Questions like "Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?" should be split two, i.e., complete and consistent.
   - Suggestion: drop-down box for standard answer/comments options → consistency
   - Possibility to evaluate the full NP period in the same file, including the 2011 evaluation → it will be possible to see progress

The following section outlines the compliance of Member States with regards to reporting of 2011 data collection in the DCF Annual Reports. The detailed spreadsheets are presented for each Member State in alphabetical order.
* -08

Member States in Alphabetical Order
• Belgium
• Bulgaria
• Cyprus
• Denmark
• Estonia
• Finland
• France
• Germany
• Ireland
• Italy
• Latvia
• Lithuania
• Malta
• Netherlands
• Poland
• Portugal
• Romania
• Slovenia
• Spain
• Sweden
• United Kingdom

* Annual Report for Greece was not submitted and thus not reviewed at EWG-12-08

	Member State:	**Belgium**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	Version 3 of 31 May 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	"April-May 2010"	
		Overall compliance	**Answer**	**EWG COMMENTS**
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	Detailed description of the structure of the Belgian fisheries. Meaning of chart on p. 11 not clear.
II	**National data collection organisation**			
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	AR text makes reference to Annex 1 containing a description of the national co-ordination meeting, but Annex I is missing.
B	**Regional and International coordination**			
B1	**Attendance of international meetings**			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	No	MS did not use reference table listing all meetings, but only a restricted list where participation was planned; only 4 of 20 meetings marked as attended in 2011; AR text makes reference to 2010
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	
B2	**Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Mostly	RCM NS&EA and RCM NA 2009 and 2010 recommendations listed (2011 missing).
		Are the responsive actions described?	Partly	MS response only included in a few cases.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
A	**General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
B	**Economic variables**			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Calculation of Achieved Sample no/ Planned for demersal trawlers 18-< 24 m incorrect
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	investment, debt asset ratio missing; CV should be 0 in case of census with 100% response rate
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	AR cannot be compared with NP because NP was incomplete in tables IIIB1 and IIIB2; information on capital value not in line with guidelines some variables are missing (Investment in physical capital and debt/asset ratio)
			Partly	see above; NP information incomplete in tables IIIB1 and IIIB2; more information should be provided on the determination of fulltime and part time employment from FTE estimate
		Are the deviations explained?		
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	CV is provided for census with 100% response rate. Apparently the calculation is wrong, as the CV must be 0 in that case. MS forgot to provide Achieved sample rates in table IIIB3
		Are the deviations explained?	N/A	Response rates lower than <70% for beam trawlers and netters are not explained
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	Alternative estimation of FTE and additional training for Capital value calculation
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	North Sea & Eastern Arctic			

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	For sampling frame TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0, no percentage (0%) provided; not clear if derogation on sampling brown shrimp fisheries was granted
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	species list not complete; CVs missing; Combinations of fishing grounds in one line make comparisons (also with Table III.E.3) difficult
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	species list not complete (e.g. sharks missing); Combinations of fishing grounds in one line make comparisons (also with Table III.E.3) difficult.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	TBB_DEF_70-99_0_0 in VIId: only 4 of 10 trips sampled at the marked (partly compensated by trips at sea); TBB_DEF_>=120_0_0 in IVb: only 2 (the tables states '1') of 6 trips sampled
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0 in IVc: not clear if derogation for sampling brown shrimp fisheries has been granted
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	RCM NS&EA 2010 recommendations listed, 2011 missing
Are the responsive actions described?	No	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	unclear how MS will deal with CV estimation in future
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

North Atlantic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CVs missing; Combinations of fishing grounds in one line make comparisons (also with Table III.E.3) difficult, *Scophthalmus rhombus* (line 36) in the Baltic Sea (IIIbcd) listed by mistake?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Combinations of fishing grounds in one line make comparisons (also with Table III.E.3) difficult.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	TBB_DEF_70-99_0_0 in VIIIab: only 2 of 5 trips sampled at the market; OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0 in VIIfg: 3-4 trips were planned in the NP, but none conducted, AR text refers to derogation (not clear if granted)
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	only this statement: "The implementation of the calculation of the CV's is a slow and step by step process for Belgium."
Are the deviations justified?		

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NA 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed; recomm. on age reading is in the wrong place (should be in section III.E), confusing note on agreement with Denmark
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	unclear how MS will deal with CV estimation in future
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

North Sea & Eastern Arctic (=the only relevant region according to NP)

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	work in progress presented
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	

Are the deviations explained?	Yes	work is still in progress
Are the deviations justified?		

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	no targets given in NP
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?		

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	not here, but under III.D.1
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	RCM NA 2010 recommendations listed, 2011 missing
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No CV's reported; Not clear what the question marks in column Q (Achieved No of individuals at a national level) for *Raja* species relate to.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Table III.E.3 is not consistent between the NP and the AR. Area/Stock descriptions differ and planned numbers in NP and AR are not always the same, and when corrected for *Gadus morhua* in IV changed a perceived oversampling to undersampling of this stock. Text in module III.E is quite confusing and explains sampling carried out in module III.C. Severe oversampling (>1000%) in several cases; AR text partly makes reference to (Reg. 1639/2001?) Appendices XII and XIII, which should be deleted.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to explain cost implications of oversampling, especially for age determination in the lab; MS to explain if undersampling of Northern hake, plaice and sole has a negative impact on the assessment of the respective stocks.
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Text not very clear - should be clarified.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS should provide CV's
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS should explain where there are deviations.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	None requested in the NP for Module III.E
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS to provide LM recommendations and actions taken
Are the responsive actions described?	No	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Missing CV values not addressed
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	

North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No CV's reported; Not clear what the question marks in column Q (Achieved No of individuals at a national level) for *Raja* species relate to.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Text in module III.E is quite confusing and explains sampling carried out in module III.C. Severe oversampling (>1000%) in several cases; AR text partly makes reference to (Reg. 1639/2001?) Appendices XII and XIII, which should be deleted.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS to explain cost implications of oversampling, especially for age determination in the lab; MS to explain if undersampling of Northern hake has a negative impact on the assessment.
Are the deviations justified?		

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	No CV's were reported. MS to provide CV's
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS to provide explanation.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	None requested in the NP for Module III.E
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS to provide LM recommendations and actions taken
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	MS should provide responsive actions.

	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Missing CV values not addressed. MS to clarify
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some effort and landings variables missing, as hours dredged, length of nets or prices. The variable named as "Energy consumption" is not in the regulation. MS to clarify why this is reported.
	F1	**Capacity**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	It appears that 8 of the 14 required effort variables are missing from Table III.F.1 MS to resubmit the table with the required variables.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	for the variables present in NP
		Are the deviations explained?	No	Response rates for census of less than 70% are not explained
		Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to resubmit an updated and corrected table.
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS must provide details on why there are missing parameters and what actions they will take to ensure this data is collected in the future.
	F3	**Landings**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	2 of the landings variables are missing from Table III.F.1 i.e. prices by commercial spp and conversion factor details. MS to update the table with these parameters.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to update and correct Table III.F.1
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	For the parameters presented in the table.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to correct and resubmit Table III.F.1
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Shortfalls identified - MS to explain why the shortfalls occurred and what they intend to do to ensure the delivery of this data in the future.
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	DYFS: Less days at sea, but planned number of hauls almost achieved. This is explained in AR.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by	Yes	

e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?		
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No major shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Mostly	In table IV.A.1 only Yes or No are valid entries. "Invasive" is case of *Crassostrea gigas* remains unclear.
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Even if no data are reported, data have to be collected. So e.g. sampling strategy, population and sampling numbers have to be reported.
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Variables have to be listed and the results of the data collection have to be shown. Then it could be indicated, that data are not reported. But this is only relevant for data calls then, not for the reporting of the collection strategy and i´s results. Requests for derogation may be made in the NP, not in the AR.

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Belgium planned to collect data for all segments and variables, no matter if freshwater or marine species. So it remains unclear why the collection is not reported for all segments and species. The difference between accounting and calendar year cannot be a justification. It has to be dealt with in The NP.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	It is explained why data are quite poor, but not why information about the collection strategy are missing.
Are the deviations justified?	No	There is a difference between the confidentiality of the value of parameters and variables and the metadata, i.e. the description of the collection strategy. MS justifies why it does not report the values, but not why information on the collection strategy is missing.

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	No	No data provided
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	Belgium is expected to provide all information as requested in the AR guidelines; any requests for derogation should be reported in the NP, not in the AR

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	If segmentation by employees is made, it should be straightforward used. Either with or without segmentation.
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is filled in incorrectly

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Insufficient information provided
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Explanation is not sufficient
Are the deviations justified?	No	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	No	MS claims no. „There were no deviations from the objective"
Are the deviations explained?	No	No explanation provided
Are the deviations justified?	No	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	Belgium should also consider using data from Structural Business Statistics / Eurostat

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Maturity data missing
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations presented in AR
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	Timing mismatch between recommendation from maturity workshops and Belgium survey
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table in NP refers to data calls for France and thus not relevant.
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	NA	also noted by recent external review (Devstat). Is not clear if a national DCF website is ready. MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	improvements in progress
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Partly	only 2009 recommendations listed (2010 and 2011 missing), format is not following the guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	suggest drop-down menues in standard tables
X	**X. References**		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

		Member State:	**Bulgaria**	
			Reference year	2011
			Version of the AR reviewed	5/31/2012
			Version of the NP proposal	3/31/2010
				Answer / **EWG COMMENTS**
			Overall compliance	
I	**General framework**		Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes / changes in fisheries are given in section III.A
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**		
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Mostly / MS should better specify the role of the two partners mentioned in the text. As reported by the MS: "....*different Bulgarian institutions involved in the Programme and to ensure that activities are being effectively carried out within the different Bulgarian organizations*", so MS should specify what are the different activities carried out by the partners involved in the DCF.
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No / In this section, there is no mentioning of a national coordination meeting.
	B	**Regional and International coordination**		
		B1 **Attendance of international meetings**		
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Partly / Not all the DCF eligible meetings are listed. Moreover, MS did not participate in some relevant - both DCF (i.e. Medits working group) and GFCM - meetings
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No
		B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions described?	Partly / only general comment that RCM recommendations are taken into account
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Partly / no detailed account for the individual recommendations provided
	SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea and Black Sea			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A	**General description of the fishing sector**		
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes
	B	**Economic variables**		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly / Fleet segments are not signaled as being clustered (*) despite table III.2 being used.
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly / The name of the segments are different from regulation. The methodology for the segments clustering should be apply
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly / CV should be specified (20% for each variable)
		B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly / The reference year should be precised (2011 or 2009 or 2010.); Only few segments are presented.
			Are the deviations explained?	No / No explanation about differences in the fleet segments and years.
			Are the deviations justified?	No
		B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Partly / Achieved sampling rate over planned sampling rate is high, but planned sampling rates are lower than in NP. No explanation on clustering or calculation of derived variables is given. CV is the same for all variables. Some crosschecking of sources, but no info on data quality measures
			Are the deviations explained?	No
			Are the deviations justified?	No
		B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	NA

acceptable?		

REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	MS has not filled this table, while it was prepared in the NP. MS should report the "Expected and Achieved number of trips" both on shore and at sea as explained in the guidelines, plus the "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year"
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is completely empty
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	It is not clear if there was an agreement at Regional level with Romania for the collection of samples and the calculation of CVs (see Romania AR). MS reported in the text that CVs for the different species has been calculated using survey data, but no CVs are present in the table. Guidelines and templates for filling in this table are not strictly followed, e.g. NP proposal provides different numbers for 'Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured/aged at national level'
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table is empty. MS justified this lacking of information with a delay in the collection of data (due to financial problem), moreover in the text of the AR there is this sentence "*.....because the results from the samples are not delivered in NAFA and the data is not available in its database. This is caused by fanatical problems that are going to be solved* ", that is not very clear. NAFA, one of the partner involved in the National DCF, has not given the data on time? Does "fanatical" problems mean "financial" problems?
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Not all the achievements are reported
Are the deviations explained?	No	Reporting of all missing information in the table and clarification of the deviations needed
Are the deviations justified?		

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	No CVs are presented in the tables, however in the text, an attempt to calculate CVs from survey data (PGMed excercise) is reported for 2010 data only.
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	no explanations given for lack of CV data for 2011
Are the deviations justified?	No	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS states that no specific recommendations were addressed to Bulgaria. However, it must be noticed that some general recommendations coming from the RCM Med&BS (concerning module C) should be followed by all MS in the Med&BS.
Are the responsive actions described?	No	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	MS justify the delay in the collection of data with financial problems, no other explanations (CV missing, number of samples achieved etc.) are given.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Achievements are not relevant due to the absence of the target species (Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the deviations explained?	NA	In the Black Sea, no large pelagic species and European eel are present.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	NA	Achievements are not relevant due to the absence of the target species (Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area
Were data quality targets met?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the deviations explained?	NA	In the Black Sea, no large pelagic species and European eel are present.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
E	**Biological stock-related variables**		
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS should clarify if there was an agreement at Regional level with Romania for the collection of samples and the calculation of CV (see Romania AR). MS reported that target precision has been achieved at a regional level but then no CV is reported. Moreover, data sources are only surveys? No biological samplings have been conducted? MS to clarify. The "Achieved No of individuals at the regional level" is not reported. MS is requested to follow the guidelines reporting the information in the table
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	The achievements are consistent at National level, must be explained and reported if a result has been achieved at Regional level (in case there was an agreement)
	Are the deviations explained?	Partly	
	Are the deviations justified?	No	The explanations are very confusing. MS should better clarify why the samples have not been delivered even if they have been collected. Moreover, MS should clarify the Regional approach. MS should clarify the "fanatical" problems!!
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS should report the CV achieved or at National and Regional level
	Were CV targets met?	NA	no CV is reported so was impossible to answer
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS stated that no specific recommendations were adressed for Bulgaria. However must be noticed that some general recommendations coming from the RCM Med&BS (concerning the module E) should be follow by all MS in the Med&BS. MS should listed all these recommendations with the responsive actions
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	Firstly MS should listed the LM recommendations
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	No actions are reported
F	**Transversal variables**		
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Data quality indicators should not be provided as all variables are either Capacity variables or come from logbooks or sales notes. Achieved sampling rate should not be provided for census
F1	**Capacity**		
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	(nevertheless Variability indicators were not shown in NP for most variables but are given in AR. Coverage rates were planned in NP but are not provided in AR tables)
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	NA	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	NA	

		acceptable?		
F2	**Effort**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	(nevertheless Variability indicators were not shown in NP for most variables but are given in AR. Coverage rates were planned in NP but are not provided in AR tables)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	(nevertheless CV is the same for all variables)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F3	**Landings**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	(nevertheless Variability indicators were not shown in NP for most variables but are given in AR. Coverage rates were planned in NP but are not provided in AR tables)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	(nevertheless CV is the same for all variables)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Surveys in the BS are two, not three as reported in the table, one pelagic and one demersal both conducted in the second and the fourth quarter of the year. It is missing any information concerning the pelagic trawl conducted in the second quarter.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	The achievements reported are consistent, MS should explain if the second quarter pelagic survey has been carried out or not
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?		
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Mostly	There is only an insufficient temporal coverage for the Pelagic survey.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?		
G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	

		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	MS needs to precise the Reference year (2009, 2010 or2011?)
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	IV.A.2 reports Census, instead of probability sample surveys in table IV A.3
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	See before. Achieved sample rate is similar to response rate (sample survey) and CV calculation should be precised (always 0.15)

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Achieved response rates differ a lot from the targets.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	No	no explanation is given
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	the planned sample is higher than the population
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Achieved sample rate is similar to response rate (sample survey) and CV calculation should be precised (always 0.15)

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	no shortfalls are described
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	not all the Expert group or Project are listed and reading the table seem that the information have not been transmitted to the mentioned expert groups
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	
Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	NA	Is not clear if a national DCF website is ready. MS to clarify
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	Yes	

		described?		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No	even if MS stated that "*Bulgaria tries to comply with the STECF recommendation but still facing difficulties in running the DCF normally*" STECF recommendations should be listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	No	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Cyprus**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	May 2010	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	**National data collection organisation**			
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	There is no mentioning of a National Coordination meeting
B	**Regional and International coordination**			
B1	**Attendance of international meetings**			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	MS did not participate to some planned meetings important for the Mediterranean (i.e. Medits WG and PGMed), without explanations.
B2	**Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Partly	In the text, only the 2007 recommendations from the RCM Med&BS are present, 2008-2010(2011) missing
		Are the responsive actions described?	Partly	Only for the 2007, the recommendations and the responsive actions are listed, again MS should specify the actions taken for the years later
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
A	**General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
B	**Economic variables**		Mostly	
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Clustered segments should be signaled by an asterisk in this section. Fleet segments names have to follow guidelines
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CVs are missing, Capital value, capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in this table.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	CVs should be provided as mentioned in NP
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Effort to increase response rates in interviews in the future are stated but not described
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	
	REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Planned regional intensity (missing in the table) and the CV calculated at regional level for the large pelagic species (i.e. *Thunnus thynnus*, *Xiphias gladius* and *Thunnus alalunga*) is missing. In the column "Intensity

		agreed at the regional level", for all large pelagic species, "No" should be replaced with "Yes".
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Partly	The required CV has been reached only for two species
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	
Are the deviations justified?		
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some métiers for discards.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
D Recreational fisheries		
D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Achievements are not relevant due to the absence of fisheries for the two target species (Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Mostly	**EEL:** a derogation has been requested because there is no Rec Fish for eel in the area. **TUNA**: during a 2008 evaluation, SGRN has requested to MS to carry out a pilot study to investigate the Rec Fishery for blue fin tuna. MS, considering that since 2009 there is no more this activity in the area and since 2011 the Rec Fish is prohibited, no pilot study was required to be carried out during 2011. Is not completely clear if the two derogations have been accepted by the SGRN/EWG
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	It is mentioned the requested derogation for the Rec Fishery of eel
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
E Biological stock-related variables		
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	As stated also by MS, in 2011 there has been a shortfall in the collection of data for 3 species
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	No explanations for two of the three species undersampled (i.e. *Boops boops* and *Spicara smaris*) is given in the text
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	CV has been provided for 5 of the 11 species/parameters considered
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Only for two species/parameters the CV resulted higher than the planned ones
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should adopt a sampling strategy that provides the necessary parameters. See general comments

E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations have been requested in the NP. No sampling activity has been carried out (for stock-related variables) for that stocks which landings do not exceed the thresholds set by the DCF.
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NO	MS has used the wrong template for table IIIF1 and several required variables are missing. MS should re-submit correct version of table. Capacity data quality should not be given. Some relevant effort variables as soaking time are not provided. Landings data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks and sale notes. CV should be given for variables issued from questionnaires. (nevertheless "100%" as a variability indicator does not make sense)
F1	**Capacity**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Capacity data quality should not be given
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F2	**Effort**			
	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Many required effort variables are missing from NP and AR so data should be re-submitted
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Effort data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks and sales notes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F3	**Landings**			
	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Landings data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks and sale notes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	

	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	General recommendations from RCM Med&BS for 2010 and 2011 not listed.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**		Yes	
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	MS has to clarify the year 2011??
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS must clarify why number of enterprises is an estimation
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS must clarify why number of enterprises is an estimation
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Estimation of the indicator 9 "Fuel efficiency" is missing, so questioning 'Y' for data collection. AR indicates that indicators 5-7 are still under development, which is inconsistent with the time lag of 2 months in the table
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations presented in AR
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	Shortfalls identified, but no action described. Since the estimation of the indicator 9 "Fuel efficiency" is missing, no actions to avoid this shortfall are described. "Polyvalent activities" are common cases in all Mediterranean area for small vessels, MS should try to estimate the indicator 9.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Not consistent with guidelines. Specific expert group or project not listed in all cases.
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table in NP refers to data calls for France and thus not relevant.
	Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	No	In the text there is any description on the Management of data
	Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	MS should provide information on this point
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	It was possible to evaluate only the transmission of the data to expert group/project, since there are no information related to the web site and management of data. MS should provide these information
	Are the deviations explained?	No	Information is missing. MS should provide firstly the requested information and describe deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Partly	only 2009 recommendations listed (2010-2011 missing)
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X	**X. References**		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Denmark**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	Feb/Mar 2011	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	Text refers to Technical Reports not to AR
II	**National data collection organisation**			
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**		N.B.: additional information on p. 58 (by mistake?)	
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	Text explains: "through electronic communication techniques regularly"
B	**Regional and International coordination**			
	B1 **Attendance of international meetings**		N.B.: additional information on p. 58 (by mistake?)	
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	MS only states that it has participated on most of planned meetings. MS did not participate in WGMEGS (which is not critical for this group, as MS does not participate in survey), WGFAST/SGCal and SIMWG (relevant) and WGDEEP, WGNAS, WGCSE, WGEF, WKFLAT (not relevant) as planned, which is not explained in the AR text
	B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic, NS&EA and NA 2011 recomm. listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
A	**General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
B	**Economic variables**			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Clustering and Capital cost procedures are not explained in the text
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	Baltic			
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
			N.B.: AR text often refers to 'ell' instead of 'eel' (to be edited in final version)	
	C1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CVs for discards missing
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	OTB_DEF_90-104_0_0 and PTM_SPF_32-89_0_0 Western Baltic: none of 8 trips per métier

	sampled; GNS_DEF_110-156_0_0 Eastern Baltic: only 8 of 20 trips sampled; LLD_ANA_0_0_0 Eastern Baltic: 4 trips sampled but none planned; LLS_DEF_0_0_0 Eastern Baltic: no trips sampled at sea; OTB_DEF_>=105_1_120 and PTM_SPF_16-104_0_0 Eastern Baltic: significantly oversampled (>300%)
Mostly	Non-sampling of PTM_SPF_32-89_0_0 Western Baltic to be explained.
Yes	

Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Partly	only given for landings
Partly	in 4 of 19 cases
Partly	MS explains that COST tool does not allow to calculate the discard CVs due to specifics of discard calculations implemented by MS
Partly	

Were CV estimates provided?
Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

NA	derogations not asked
Yes	RCM Baltic 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed
Yes	
Yes	

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Yes	improvements in sampling design
Yes	

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Yes	contains comments in Danish in column J (Sampling strategy)
Yes	
Mostly	CVs for discards missing
Yes	
Partly	Several métiers where not samples as planned, with no significant drop in the total number of trips in the sampling year (GNS_DEF_120-219_0_0, GNS_DEF_>=220_0_0, GNS_DEF_90-99_0_0); SDN_DEF_90-119_0_0: only 5 of 16 planned trips sampled; OTB_DEF_<16_0_0: only half of the trips sampled although total no. of trips increased; OTB_MCD_70-99_0_0: only 2 of 18 trips sampled; several métiers oversampled by >200% although total no. of trips did not increase (significantly)
Yes	usually changes in fisheries pattern
Yes	

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Partly	only given for landings
Partly	in 7 of 50 cases
yes	same explanation as for Baltic
Partly	

Were CV estimates provided?
Were CV targets met?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

NA	no derogations asked
Yes	RCM NS&EA 2011 recommendations listed (2010 missing), RCM NA 2011 recommendation included here by mistake?
Yes	
Yes	

Were the relevant derogations listed?
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?
Are the responsive actions described?
Are the responsive actions acceptable?

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Yes	improvements in sampling approach
Yes	

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?

North Atlantic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Yes	only one métier (OTM_SPF_32-69_0_0)
Yes	
Yes	
Yes	
No	oversampled by >500%
Yes	target species changed
Yes	

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?
Are the deviations explained?
Are the deviations justified?

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

		Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	only given for landings
		Were CV targets met?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Reference to Baltic section
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	under 'Baltic Sea'
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
Baltic and North Sea & Eastern Arctic				
D	**Recreational fisheries**		N.B.: MS provides separate 22 p. report on recreational fisheries on cod, eel and sea trout	
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	Yes	
		Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogation asked
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	RCM NS&EA 2009 recommendation listed, RCM Baltic 2010 missing
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Salmon is gaining importance
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
Baltic				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	significantly less sex-ratios@age and maturity@age for dab and sprat than planned
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	No CV's provided for sex and maturity, or for age and weight of discards. MS says it does not provide CV's for any parameter that cannot be calculated using COST. MS to provide CV's
		Were CV targets met?	No	very few cases where achieved CV was below target CV
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations requested in the 2011 NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly	Second recommendation not actioned yet.
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
North Sea & Eastern Arctic				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	significantly less sex-ratios@age and maturity@age than planned for cod in IIIaN, dab in IV, haddock in IIIa, Northern hake, blue whiting, saithe, turbot and Norway pout; only few age readings for blue whiting, turbot, sole in IIIa and Norway pout; cost implications of oversampling of >1000% for herring in IIIa and IV, *Nephrops* and *Pandalus* in IIIa and plaice in IV?
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	impact of undersampling on stock assessment often not clear. No explaination provided for significant undersampling of sole IIIa for length@age and weight@age. MS to provide

		explaination.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	No CV's provided for sex and maturity, or for age and weight of discards. MS says it does not provide CV's for any parameter that cannot be calculated using COST. MS to provide CV's
Were CV targets met?	No	very few cases where achieved CV was below target CV
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations requested in NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	one RCM NS&EA 2011 recommendation listed
Are the responsive actions described?	No	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	No formal action taken by Denmark yet.

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	under 'Baltic Sea'
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	In the NP only blue whiting sampling was proposed, but it was not carried out. Boarfish was not planned but were sampled.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	change in target species (boarfish), but the text refers to 2010 not 2011 sampling. Also the remaining text refers to the North Sea and is not relevant to the North Atlantic. MS is requested to submit correct text.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	Text not relevant for North Atlantic. No explanation provided for Blue whiting.
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to calculate and provide CV's

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations requested in NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS says there were no shortfalls, even though Blue whiting was not sampled.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	MS to provide information on proposed actions.

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	Data quality information is missing for more than half of the effort variables
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	No explanation provided. MS to clarify

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS to provide text on actions to avoid shortfalls.

F3 Landings

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	No description is provided in this module - the MS merely says that all was completed as per the NP. This is not sufficient to make an evaluation. It would appear from Table III.F.1 that Logbooks are not considered any more as a Data source for landings. MS is asked to resubmit this chapter with text details and to update the table to make it clear what was done in 2011.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	See comment above

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	partly	MS to clarify what was completed in 2011.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS to clarify what was completed in 2011.

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS to resubmit this chapter.

G Research surveys at sea

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Only 44% achievement of acoustic survey tracks for NS herring survey.
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS needs to explain deviation from planned acoustic survey Nm
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	But see remarks below about response rate
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	But see remarks below about response rate

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Denmark stated in the NP, that about 60% of the turnover of the sectors farms are asked in a non-probability survey and by combining and imputing, e.g. by regression analysis, missing values are calculated. This means that not all data are original from the questionnaire and even a response rate of 100% is not reached. MS is asked to clarify this.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	No	Pending clarification about the response rate

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	CV is missing, but necessary if response rate is actually only 60%. To be clarified.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	No	Pending clarification about the response rate

	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
B		**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No information or explanation for the missing variable Subsidies.
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Denmark stated in the NP, that some values are imputed (see aquaculture also). This is not reflected by 100& response rates. MS is asked to clarify, why the difference between NP and AR report occurs.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Unclear if CV is necessary, see above.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	Pending clarification on response rate
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Meeting on aquaculture is not correct reported in this section.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V		**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	time lag for survey data not filled in
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations presented in AR
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VI		**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	old acronyms for Expert (Working) Groups to be edited
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table not completed in NP
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	NA	Is not clear if a national DCF website is ready. MS to clarify
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations according to MS. See data deficiency listed by JRC/ICES
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII		**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	No	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
VIII		**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX		**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X		**X. References**		
		Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI		**XI. Annexes**		
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

		Member State:	**Estonia**	
			Reference year	2011
			Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012
			Version of the NP proposal	20-Sep-2010
				Answer / **EWG 12-08 COMMENTS**
			Overall compliance	
I	**General framework**		Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**		
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Partly — No description on how cooperation is coordinated. No coordination meetings.
	B	**Regional and International coordination**		
		B1 **Attendance of international meetings**		
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Mostly — Workshops of general interest (e.g. economics, WKNARC, WKPICS, SGPIDS etc.) not attended
		B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Partly — No recommendations from RCM Baltic 2010. Several relevant for Estonia (e.g. obligation to upload to RDB-FishFrame)
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes — Comments rather brief in general
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly
	SUPRA-REGION Baltic and NAFO			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A	**General description of the fishing sector**		
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes — Short but ok. No change from NP 09-10.
	B	**Economic variables**		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — CV should be presented for all variables. In addition to this, in those cases where response rate of census <70% other variability indicators should be provided in addition to CV. Annual depreciation and value of quota should not be presented in this table.
		B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly — The calculation of derived variables is not included in this section (it is in the next, data quality)Methods for estimation of capital value are not fully presented
			Are the deviations explained?	Partly — A lot more clustering has taken place, including adding new segments to differently planned clusters and the explanation in the report does not match with the table.
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly
		B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
	REGION Baltic			
	C	**Biological métier related variables**		
		C1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — "Total number of trips during sampling year" is missing for all métiers in the Baltic. No link between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, as "Sampling frame codes" are missing.
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes — Total number of trips during sampling year is missing for all strategies in the Baltic.
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Mostly — Only results from unsorted catches, doubtful

guidelines?		that there are no discards at all
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Inconsistency of métier naming/merging between Tables III.C.2 and III.C.6
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	significant under- and over sampling.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Significant oversampling of, *Platichtys flesus*, *Perca fluviatilis*, *Clupea harengus* and *Sprattus sprattus* was claimed to be due to increased sampling effort, but no no. of trips in 2011 is given in Table III.C.3 to check if this was due to an increase in the no. of trips.

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Only for unsorted catches
Were CV targets met?	Partly	in 5 of 12 cases
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	briefly
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations listed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No recommendation after 2008 is listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	Only that alternative method should be used.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	

REGION North Atlantic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No link between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, as "Sampling frame codes" are missing.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Only results from unsorted catches, doubtful that there are no discards at all
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Greenland halibut and Northern shrimp are sampled in high numbers.

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogation listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No recommendation after 2008.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Fishery in the region is declining.

REGION Baltic

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?		

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	Mostly	Only quantitative measures given.
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Hobby fishery proved irrelevant.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	No derogation
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Recreational fishery data available but not submitted to relevant WGs.

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Baltic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly
Are the deviations explained?	Yes — Decreased fishery, high purchase prices and many species caught as occasionally bycatch
Are the deviations justified?	yes

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No — MS should provide CVs
Were CV targets met?	NA
Are the deviations explained?	No — Too low fishing effort. MS should still attempt to calculate.
Are the deviations justified?	NA — see general comments

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	no — MS should clarify which derogations were previously requested
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no — only one recommendation from 2008 concerning ageing of new species.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no — Actions should be provided specifically for the Baltic region

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes — Better planning of NP and increased national funds.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	yes — more effort should be made to task share with other MS

REGION North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	no — No number of planned samples in NP (planning is difficult)
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA
Are the deviations explained?	yes
Are the deviations justified?	yes

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	no — MS to provide CVs
Were CV targets met?	NA
Are the deviations explained?	no — MS should provide explanations
Are the deviations justified?	NA — see general comments

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No — MS should clarify which stocks they request derogations for and which are fished irregularly
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No — No recommendations after 2008.
Are the responsive actions described?	no — MS should list proposed actions
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA — recommendations post 2008 for NA should be listed

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No — Shortfalls identified but no action suggested.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — CV should be given for landings variables not issued from logbooks or sales notes. Data sources for effort do not coincide with the report text, which mentions also logbook data (for vessels <12m). EFIS is a database, not a data source. If further information is available on the kind of data source, a link could be provided. It is not clear whether effort and landing data is collected for all segments or only for some.

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
Are the deviations explained?	NA
Are the deviations justified?	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	NA
Are the deviations explained?	NA
Are the deviations justified?	NA

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA

F2 Effort

F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Yes

			proposal?	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly: Data collection was not exhaustive as data for vessels <12m were not presented. Effort data quality should be provided in the table when they are not issued from logbooks or sales notes.
			Are the deviations explained?	No: No explanation was given by MS
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No: Proposed actions for vessel <12m should be listed
	F3	**Landings**		
		F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA: Data collection was exhaustive according to MS.
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly: Acoustic surveys do not have any nautical mile targets that should be included to measure achievement
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes: Mistake in NP
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes: Bad weather (BITS 4q)
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: no recommendation relevant
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA: No shortfalls identified.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**			
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes: Even if sampling rate is equal to response rate in the Estonian case it should be reported.
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes: In case of trout farming, coverage rate of the sector in terms of turnover or production value could help to assess the relevance of

			missing information for some items.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly — Only EEZ discussed and not all areas of national fisheries
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No — Very little bottom trawling, but not listed as derogation
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA — No shortfall identified.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No — Acronym of the RFMO provided, but not the specific expert group or project. Partial information for stocks.
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly — See data deficiency listed by JRC/ICES
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Partly — Few details provided.
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA
		Are the deviations explained?	No — See data deficiency listed by JRC/ICES
		Are the deviations justified?	NA — No deviations according to MS.
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No — MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Partly — MS should list all relevant (EWG 11-08, SGECA 2010) recommendations from 2010 and 2011.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes — Not complete (e.g. EME, EMA and STECF are missing)
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No
X	**X. References**		
		Is there a complete list of references?	No

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		No annexes available.

	Member State:	Finland		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	19-Jan-2011	
			Answer	EWG COMMENTS
		Overall compliance		
I	General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	One physical and one video-conference.
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	Mostly work overload
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	Only 6th LM (2009), not the latest one
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	All positive
SUPRA-REGION Baltic				
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	No significant changes.
B	Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	(1) The clustered segments should be noted with an asterix. (2) Supra region has to be written according to the guidelines.(3) Length class should be presented in the corresponding column. (4) It is impossible to analyse 'Other Region' because it is not split in the technical report
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	(1) Supra region has to be written according to the guidelines. (2) MS has to specify why segments not clustered are in this table
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	(1) Supra region has to be written according to the guidelines. (2) Capital value, capital cost and transversal variables should be erases from this table IIIF.1 . (3) Length class should be presented in the corresponding column. (4) MS should provide response rate and achievement rate. (5) MS must clarify the NR signification.
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	MS did not provide response rate and achievement rates in the table III B 3
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	MS has to clarify how they would like to improve the shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	MS has to clarify how they would like to improve the shortfalls
REGION Baltic				
C	Biological métier related variables			
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV was calculated for sprat , herring and salmon

		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Most métiers are mostly sampled sufficiently
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	
		Were CV targets met?	Partly	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Low catches are given as explanation.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Only in text
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	All positive
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Actions are given.
REGION Baltic				
D	**Recreational fisheries**			
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Biennial postal sampling survey.
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	No derogations
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	Yes	Variance estimates
		Were data quality targets met?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	All positive
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified by MS
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION Baltic				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	(1) CV's for 6 of 7 stock to be sampled. (2) No CV's for *Sander lucioperca*. (3) MS to provide CV's for *Sander*.
		Were CV targets met?	Partly	CV targets reached for 11 out of 22 calculated combinations.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	(1) No text provided where CV targets are not reached. (2) Also no explanation on how CV's were calculated. MS to provide this information.
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Yes for the sampling levels, but MS needs to provide information on missing CV's and methodology.
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations requested in the NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	In relation to pike perch age reading
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Plan to get ages ready for report. Keeping deadlines.
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	(1) Capacity data quality should not be given. (2) Need to provide data source etc.. (3) In Table III.F.1 for Conversion factor per spp.
	F1	**Capacity**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**			
		F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F3	**Landings**			
		F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	CV was stated for prices in NP and is not given, the same for coverage rates
			Are the deviations explained?	No	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to clarify.
		F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Issue with CV's for non quota species
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	Information required on the use of questionnaires and the associated CV's
G	**Research surveys at sea**				
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No NP values and achievements for BITS 3q. No Nm of echo integrating tracks given as measure.
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Information taken from the text
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Bad weather
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	Maps are in annex II and not in main body.
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future	NA	No shortfalls identified.

		described?	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA — Section is empty.
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**		
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**		
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
	A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — Achievement sample rates and achieved sample rates/planned sample rates are false
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No — If achievement sample rate would be under 70, CV is needed MS has to clarify response rate
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes — No derogations
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No — No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes — Due to national rules of data confidentiality the landings of even ranked métiers (table III_C_1) are not given even though the data are available for the ICES assessments WG.
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Partly — Briefly status of new national data base.
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes — "The development of the national database continued according to the NP. "
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes — Data confidentiality an issue for MS
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA — No text
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA

VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	Mostly from SGECA/SGRN
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Member State:	**France**		
	Reference year	2011	
	Version of the AR reviewed	08-June-2012	
	Version of the NP proposal	01-Dec-2010	
	Overall compliance	**Answer**	**EWG COMMENTS**
I General framework			
	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II National data collection organisation			
A National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
B Regional and International coordination			
B1 Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	MS did not participate in some meetings planned (mainly of second priority in term of interest for MS), due to lack of experts available.
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No	MS should list in this section all the relevant recommendations from all RCMs which are not dealt with a specific section of the report (see guidelines)
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	Since no recommendations are listed, it is impossible to evaluate the responsive actions
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	Reference to NP description.
SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
B Economic variables			
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information on sample rate and collection scheme is missing for some segments. Unclustered segments are provided in table IIIB1 - it should contain the clustered segments.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CV and response rates are not provided. France did not use the template for IIIB3, the terminology in the fleet segment gear column is not consistent with guidelines
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	NP contains more segments and more vessels than AR; AR should clarify the reason
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	CV and response rates are not provided for any segment and variable.
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	No	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	France had deviations from NP proposal with respect to data quality indicators, but did not indicate any justification nor a way how to solve this problem in the future.
SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea & Black Sea			
B Economic variables			
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information on sample rate and collection scheme is missing for some segments. Unclustered segments are provided in table

		IIIB1 - it should contain the clustered segments.
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	CV and response rates are not provided. France did not use the template for IIIB3, the terminology in the fleet segment gear column is not consistent with guidelines
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	NP contains more segments and more vessels than AR; AR should clarify the reason
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	CV and response rates are not provided for any segment and variable.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	France had deviations from NP proposal with respect to data quality indicators, but did not indicate any justification nor a way how to solve this problem in the future.

SUPRA-REGION Other regions

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Achieved sample numbers and rates are missing for most segments. Unclustered segments are provided in table IIIB1 - it should contain the clustered segments. Achieved sample no/planned sample no. is not calculated correctly.
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Clustered segment should be named after the most important segment. Number of vessels in the segment from the most recent information is not consistent with the total number of the cluster.
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Some variables are missing. Most segments are missing. The sample rates do not correspond with the numbers provided in table IIIB1 CV and response rates are not provided. France did not use the template for IIIB3, the terminology in the fleet segment gear column is not consistent with guidelines.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	France had deviations from NP proposal with respect to data quality indicators, but did not indicate any justification nor a way how to solve this problem in the future.

REGION North Sea & Eastern Arctic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Discrepancies in the number of trips reported in the table with the ones reported in the text of the AR. Big discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". Moreover, the number of

				trips planned and achieved does not correspond between the two tables and again with the text. The column "Achieved number of trips" should be filled in. No number of trips on shore is reported.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The number of trips reported in the table with the ones reported in the text of the AR in this case is the same. As reported in the previous comment, big discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". Moreover, the number of trips planned and achieved do not correspond between the two tables.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Métier should be reported at level 6. Métier in Table III.C.6 should reflect métiers reported in Table III.C.3. Name of the Region should be consistent with Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Only 28 trips on shore compared to 74 planned (38%) have been achieved. On the contrary, MS has increased the at sea sampling: 143 vs 104 planned. For the future, due to the difficulty to carry out observations in some places, MS should adjust his NP consequently.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
		Were CV targets met?	No	CV requirements have not been reached. MS has reported that the CV for the length structure tends to plateau at 0.15-0.2
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some métiers
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	There is no mentioning of the year of the RCM.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	Only actions to avoid shortfalls regarding on-shore sampling are explained.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION North Atlantic				
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	There are discrepancies between trips reported in the table with the ones reported in the AR text. Big discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". As requested by the Guidelines, MS should "Provide the number of achieved number of trips sampled on shore". Moreover, the number of trips planned and achieved do not correspond between the two tables and again with the text. The column "Achieved number of trips" is not filled. No number of trips on shore is reported. The "Sampling frame codes" do not match the ones in Table III.C.4.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	As reported in the previous comment, there are big discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". Moreover, the number of trips planned and achieved do not correspond between the two tables, the "Sampling frame codes" do not match with Table III.C.3.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Name of the Region should be consistent with the previous tables and with Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Métiers should be reported at level 6. Incorrect name of the Region in the table, should be consistent with the previous tables and with Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU.

	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Only 400 trips at sea compared to 572 planned (67%) have been achieved. On the contrary, MS has increased the on shore sampling: 593 vs 358 planned. Regarding NAFO, sampling intensity for length compositions (*Gadus morhua*) was not achieved, but planned. However, sampling plans in the NAFO are do not appear in Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4.
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	The overall achievements do not give a real picture of métier sampling (e.g. OTB_DWS+OTB_DEF_Saith and FPO_MOL_0_0_0 achieved 0%; LLS_DEF_0_0_0 achieved 483%). More detailed explanations are needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	see above.
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	No	
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some métiers.
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	There is no mentioning of the year of the RCM.
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

C **Biological métier related variables**

C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Discrepancies between number of trips reported in the table and numbers reported in the text. In the text, 209 trips on-shore are reported, whereas 0 are reported in the table. 174 trips achieved at sea are reported in the text of the AR, whereas 171 are reported in the table. Name of the Region should be consistent with the previous tables and with Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU. Some major discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". Moreover, the number of trips planned and achieved do not correspond between the two tables. The column "Achieved number of trips" is not filled. Number of trips on shore is not reported.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some major discrepancies (e.g. total no. of trips) between Tables III.C.3 and III.C.4, in the column "Total No. of trips during the Sampling year". Name of the Region should be consistent with the previous tables and with Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU. Moreover, the number of trips planned and achieved do not correspond between the two tables.
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS should report in the columns "Intensity" and "Planned minimum no. of fish to be measured/aged at the regional level" the agreement reached at Regional level for large pelagic sampling and should report the CV estimated at Regional level.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Mediterranean and Black Sea Region is completely missing from this table.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Only 49 out of 150 demersal trawl trips were sampled. According to Table III.C.5, only 2 out of 10 planned species achieved the planned number of individuals.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	The CV achieved "on retained catches and/or landings" has been calculated only for two species (*S. pilchardus* and *M. barbatus*). For the remaining species, CVs have been provided only for the discarded fraction.
	Were CV targets met?	No	

Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	There are none r of RCM.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Indian Ocean (IOTC)

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables. Sampling frame codes are missing and it is difficult to evaluate consistencies with Table III.C.4.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No CV estimation is reported. For the estimation of the CV, MS refers to the text (where a general estimation of CV is reported), but it is not possible to associate the results reported in the text with the different species present in the table (even if those species are considered by catch). MS should adjust the table consequently following the guidelines. Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention (Appendix II of Decision 2010/93/EU and should be consistent with the other tables. In this table the sampling year reported is 2010, MS should adjust the table
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS justify the absence of the CV in the table providing that it is reported in the text. However, following the guidelines MS should report the CV for all the species and the results obtained, even if higher than the required ones, should be listed in the table.
Were CV targets met?	No	Reading the text seems that the CV estimates for all the species combined and for a single métier (i.e. Purse seine) is around 18%. MS to clarify it.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should clarify, and justify, if the estimation of the CV is feasible for the area (at species level as required from table III.C.5). MS to clarify.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Eastern Central Atlantic (ICCAT)

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables. Sampling frame codes are missing.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables. Sampling frame codes

			are missing. Regarding purse seiners, even if the achieved number of trips is below 90%, the métier coverage is 100%. In hand and pole lines the coverage is 13 trips sampled out of 14 trips performed.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No CV estimation is reported. For the estimation of the CV MS refers to the text (where is reported a general estimation of CV), but it is not possible to associate the results reported in the text with the different species present in the table (even if those species are considered by catch). MS should adjust the table consequently following the guidelines. Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS should change the reported sampling year in 2011. The name of the Region should be consistent with the one reported in the Appendix II of the EU Dec 93/2010.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS justify the absence of the CV in the table providing that it is reported in the text. However, following the guidelines MS should report the CV for all the species and the results obtained, even if higher than the required ones, should be listed in the table. The explanation is based on a detailed study carried out for the Indian ocean.
		Were CV targets met?	No	Reading the text seems that the CV estimates for all the species combined and for a single métier (i.e. Purse seine) is around 18%. The explanation is based on a detailed study carried out for the Indian ocean. MS should clarify it
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should clarify, and justify, if the estimation of the CV is feasible for the area (at species level as required from table III.C.5). MS to clarify.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION Western Central Atlantic (WECAF)				
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
	C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The name of the Region should be consistent with the one reported in the Appendix II of the EU Dec 93/2010. Achieved number of trips not reported in column Q.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The name of the Region should be consistent with the one reported in the Appendix II of the EU Dec 93/2010. % achieved number of trips not reported.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	According to the text more than 2 species should appear in this table. CVs not provided. The name of the Region should be consistent with the one reported in the Appendix II of the EU Dec 93/2010.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The Region is missing from this table
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	No	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION All maritime regions (North sea, North Atlantic, Mediterranean Sea)

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	According to the text, based on low quality estimates and cost efficiency of the surveys, no study on Atlantic Cod in 2011 has been conducted.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	MS should mention the derogation already asked in the NP2011.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	Mostly	Only for the European Sea bass a data quality target has been provided. Regarding Bluefin tuna, at least data transmitted to ICCAT should be provided.
Were data quality targets met?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR, but some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	There is no mention to the year of RCM.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Inland waters

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Only for the Atlantic Salmon was possible to carry out the activity, concerning eel MS stated that: "*The eel management plan adopted at the end of 2008 plus the overlap between catch monitoring measures have compromised the credibility of operations for declarations to be made by fishermen.*"
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	see comment above
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	Even if MS stated that "an *estimate of the bias due to undeclared catches of individual fish has been calculated",* this estimation is not reported.
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION North Sea & Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is not completely fulfilled, the CV values are missing, and MS should fill the column named "Achieved No of individuals

		at the regional level"
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS should explain why has been able to provide estimation for some parameters and not for the all ones for some species and surveys (e.g. length/weight for the *M. aeglefinus*). In some cases, where surveys are the only sources for the collection of stock related variables, the numbers of fish collected is 0 (i.e. *Raja* sp.).
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Even if MS stated that "*Where surveys are the only sources for these data, the numbers of fish collected may turn out to be lower than the objectives planned in the national programme...*" MS in these cases, to achieved the target issues, should use the market/landing/at sea sampling data

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS stated that the levels of precision obtained for the biological variables have not yet been analysed. The COST tools enable these estimates to be made.
Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS stated that :"A*nalysis of levels of precision has started for the biological variables. This will help the teams in optimising the number of individuals to collect"*. However, after 12 years of DCF an estimation of CV for the stock variables should be provided.
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide an estimation of the CV even if it could result higher than the planned ones

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR, some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some stocks. MS should mention these derogations and precise if have been accepted or not
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should be able to provide the real use of the proposed tools shortly

REGION North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is not completely fulfilled, the CV values are missing
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	MS stated that "W*here surveys are the only sources for these data, the numbers of fish collected is in some cases lower than the objectives planned in the national programme."* However in some cases the number of fish resulted lower also for samples collected from commercial landing or on shore (i.e. *Nephrops norvegiucs*).
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS gives justification only for some species but, as example, any explanations are provided for *N. norvegicus* and the different species of Raja. MS should clarify it
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should clarify the "0" samples achievements for some species (e.g. why no samples of *N. norvegicus* have been collected? In the NP 2011 Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at a national level was around 20000!!)

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS stated that the levels of precision obtained for the biological variables have not yet been analysed. The COST tools enable these estimates to be made.
Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS stated that :"A*nalysis of levels of precision has started for the biological variables. This will help the teams in optimising the number of individuals to collect"*. However, an attempt to estimate the CV for the stock variables should be provided.
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide an estimation of the CV even if it could result higher than the planned

		ones
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR, some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some stocks. MS should mention these derogations and precise if have been accepted or not
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	MS should be able to accelerate the process in order to answer to the end users
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should be able to provide the real use of the proposed tools shortly

REGION Mediterranean Sea & Black Sea

E Biological stock-related variables

E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is not completely fulfilled, the CV values are missing
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS should provide information on *N. norvegicus*; the length at age samples for hake are missing and no samples for *E. cirrhosa* have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should provide information on *N. norvegicus*;
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should better specify the problems encountered with *E. cirrhosa* and *N. norvegicus* samples.
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Were CV estimates provided?	No	MS stated that the levels of precision obtained for the biological variables have not yet been analysed. The COST tools enable these estimates to be made.
Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS stated that :"A*nalysis of levels of precision has started for the biological variables. This will help the teams in optimising the number of individuals to collect"*. However, an attempt to estimate the CV for the stock variables should be provided, also the work and the results obtained during PGMed (estimation of CV for shared stocks between Spain and France) should be reported
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide an estimation of the CV even if it could result higher than the planned ones
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should list the recommendations from RCM Med&BS endorsed by LM plus the responsive actions taken by MS
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should be able to provide the real use of the proposed tools shortly

REGION Indian Ocean

E Biological stock-related variables

E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables. Table is not completely fulfilled, the CV values are missing
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	The "Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at a national level" has been achieved only for the species *Thunnus albacares*, no data are reported for the other species (even if a planned number was reported)
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should report at least the samples data from observers for the species bigeye and skipjack tunas
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide an estimation of the CV at

		least for the only species collected (i.e. yellow fin tuna) even if it could result higher than the planned ones

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS should be able to describe the actions to avoid the shortfalls in the future (i.e. no samples of the two species of tunas). Is MS will be able to solve "logistic" problems in the future?
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Eastern Central Atlantic (ICCAT)

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No data are reported. Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No data are reported
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	see the comments reported in the AR 2011 under section "ECA- III.E.1 Achievements: results and deviation from NP proposal"
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	No data are reported
Were CV targets met?	NA	No CV have been provided
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	MS stated that the problems encountered in 2011 have been solved and the sampling will start again in 2012
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION WECAF

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is not completely fulfilled, the CV values are missing. Name of the Region should respect the naming convention and should be consistent with the other tables.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	no deviations from NP
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	No	MS should provide an estimation of the CV for the two species collected even if it could result higher than the planned ones
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS should firstly provide the CV
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Inland waters (eels and salmon)

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The situation of the Inland waters (eels and salmon) is reported in the text of the AR but nothing is reported in the table III.E.3, MS should clarify it. It is not clear if MS has to report the information (sex, maturity, age and the associated CV) linked to the stock related variables or not
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
F1	**Capacity**			
	F11	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F12	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F13	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
F2	**Effort**			
	F21	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F22	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Bootstrap percentiles are not provided as stated in the proposal.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F23	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	F24	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
F3	**Landings**			
	F31	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F32	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Bootstrap percentiles are not provided as stated in the proposal, and some response lates, specially in the Mediterranean, are low for census (<70%)
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?		

		F33	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
		F34	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes: **Comments for the EWG:** it should be checked if in the table a surveys can be repeated more than one time following the different Type of Sampling activities carried out (i.e. Fish Hauls + hydrology, Echo Nm, hauls…) and/or the period of the year
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA: no deviations from the NP
			Are the deviations justified?	
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No: General recommendations from RCM Med&BS for 2010 and 2011 not listed. No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations for other areas
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**			
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes: Wrong calculation of ratio achieved/planned sample rate
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly: Wrong calculation of ratio "achieved/planned sample rate". CV is missing except for census with high response rates. In some cases, the response rate is 10 times the achieved sample rate, this is obviously wrong.
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Partly: CV is missing completely
			Are the deviations explained?	No
			Are the deviations justified?	No
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes: Nothing said about missing quality indicators
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly: France had deviations from NP proposal with respect to data quality indicators, but did not indicate any justification nor a way how to solve this problem in the future.
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**			

		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Good example for assessing "representativeness"
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Even if calculated annually Indicator 9 should be reported in the table
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Only for indicator 8 and 9
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	Only the recommendations impacting the 2011 sampling activities were cited here. Not clear if all recommendations are listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Germany**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	29-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	30-Mar-2010	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A **National correspondent and participating institutes**			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	
	B **Regional and International coordination**			
	B1 **Attendance of international meetings**			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
	B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No	Recommendations not listed. Bilateral agreements mentioned but not attached.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A **General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	
	B **Economic variables**			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Methods change had been accepted because it was SGECA recommendations to change data collection scheme B to C
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic			
	C **Biological métier related variables**			
	C1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	"Achieved no of fish measured at a national level by métier" not given (only ref. to Table III.C.6 (all métiers summed)). Columns added for separate listing of length- and age results. *Pleuronectes platessa* was not planned but is reported without CV.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Over- and under sampling
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C2 **Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	No CV for discard volume. 4 species missing for landings and discards.
		Were CV targets met?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	

Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?		No derogation listed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	No data from IIIa due to only bilateral agreement with SWE and DK.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	"Achieved no of fish measured at a national level by métier" not given (only ref. to Table III.C.6 (all métiers summed)). Columns added for separate listing of length- and age results.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Over- and under sampling
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	No CV for discard volume.
Were CV targets met?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?		No derogation listed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION East Atlantic and NAFO

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Métier naming should be consistent between the text and the tables (e.g. OTB_DEF_>=130_0_0 appears in text as OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0).
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Same as above.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	"Achieved no of fish measured at a national level by métier" not given (only ref. to Table III.C.6 (all métiers summed)). Columns added for separate listing of length- and age results.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Over- and under sampling
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	No CV for discard volume.
Were CV targets met?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?		No derogation listed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Long Distance Fisheries

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Is multilateral agreements an excuse for not giving any sampling level?
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Is multilateral agreements an excuse for not giving any sampling level?
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No table. Data not available due to multilateral agreements.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Could not be checked. Data not available.

		Are the deviations explained?	NA	Claimed by MS not to be relevant.
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA	Could not be checked. Data not available.
		Were CV targets met?	NA	Could not be checked. Data not available.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	Data not available due to multilateral agreements.
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation listed
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Multilateral agreement to be provided.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Multilateral agreement to be provided.
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Fishery has stopped or multilateral sampling schemes under development
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Baltic				
D	**Recreational fisheries**			
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	No	
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION North Sea and East Arctic				
D	**Recreational fisheries**			
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	No	"Not relevant" according to MS
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No relevant recommendations since 2009.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	"Not relevant" according to MS
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Baltic				
				MS should report always the appropriate comments and text in the AR under each section, even if it is a duplication of the text, without referring to another section
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Columns C, M and Q for eel and plaice are of wrong format (%). The CV should be reported in the same unit (percentage?) both in columns L and O. MS should adjust it
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Eel has been under sampled. Flounder over sampled.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	For some species the CV has not been provided. In the text of

		the AR (i.e. III E 2 Data quality: Results and Deviation from NP Proposal) MS should report the appropriate comments without referring to another section
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Only for three species and for the same parameter (length at age) has been achieved the required precision level
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS only mentioned the Non-applicance for COST and own algorithms under development, but no mention to the deviation from the required CV is presented
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide better explanations

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no relevant derogation are listed in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Yes
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Yes
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS refers only to the intensity of sampling and not to the quality of the data

REGION North Sea and East Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The CV should be reported in the same unit (percentage?) both in column L and O
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Extreme over-sampling for some species e.g. *Clupea harengus* and *Sebastes sp.* (3631% and 5455%). Some other species have been under sampled (e.g. *Gadus morhua*, *Limanda limanda*)
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	For some species the CV has not been provided. In the text of the AR (i.e. III E 2 Data quality: Results and Deviation from NP Proposal) MS should report the appropriate comments
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Only for five species and for the same parameter (length at age) has been achieved the required precision level
Are the deviations explained?	No	MS only mentioned the Non-applicance for COST and own algorithms under development, but no mention to the deviation from the required CV is presented
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide better explanations

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations listed
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	In the text of the AR (i.e. III E 4 Actions to avoid shortfalls) MS should report the appropriate comments without referring to another section
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	

REGION Long Distance Fisheries

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	A multilateral agreement is cited by MS, but the table is completely empty. The number of achievements, at least at Regional level, should be reported. In the text of the AR, MS reported that: "*Table III.E.3 provides an overview on required, planned and achieved numbers of fish for age, weight, sex and maturity. Germany was*

		obliged to sample three stocks after applying the exemption rules for stock-related variables (Commission Decision 2010/93/EU, chapter III.B.B2.5) for other regions, namely: Sardina pilchardus, Sardinella aurita, Trachurus spp." Reading the text and then having a look on the empty table the situation appears confused, MS should better explain what are the targets in this area and the role of the MS
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should better explain if some results were obtained from the multilateral agreement. Have been able the other MSs involved in the Regional sampling to achieved the sampling plan? MS to clarify

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	Explanations are given in section C
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Only a derogation on the sampling activity for *S. aurita* is mentioned in the text
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Recommendations are in section C
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Partly	It is only reported that "*Germany is actively involved*" but it is not reported what are practically the follows up of MS. MS should clarify it

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should better explain the outputs and the follow up of the multilateral sampling agreements

REGION East Atlantic and NAFO

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	MS should follow the naming convention (Annex II EU DEC 93/2010) for the name of the Region. NAFO SA1-2 is not a Region!!
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	In general quite big variation around the planned number reported in the NP
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	For most of the parameters and species, reported in the table, the CV has not been provided.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Only for one species has been achieved the required precision level
Are the deviations explained?	No	In the text of the AR (i.e. III E 2 Data quality: Results and Deviation from NP Proposal) MS should report the appropriate comments without referring to another section. MS only mentioned the Non-applicance for COST and own algorithms under development, but no mention to the deviation from the required CV is presented
Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should provide better explanations

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	

				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	
F	**Transversal variables**				
				Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	F1	**Capacity**			
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**			
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Calculation of response rate according to AR guidelines is not followed, census response rate should coincide with achieved no./ population no. MS should explain if for the small vessel is applied a census or a random survey (as reported in the AR text)
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F3	**Landings**			
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
				Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Calculation of response rate according to AR guidelines should coincide with achieved no./ population no
				Are the deviations explained?	NA	
				Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
				Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	**Research surveys at sea**				
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
				Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
				Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Herring larva survey and herring acoustic survey are only app. 50% accomplished.
				Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
				Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
				Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
				Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
				Are the deviations explained?	N/A	No deviations
				Are the deviations justified?	N/A	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
				Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No relevant recommendations
				Are the responsive actions described?	N/A	
				Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A	
				Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**				
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**				Yes	
				Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	

			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	It is not clear why some CV of variables are not calculated (in case of response rate < 70%). It is not so clear why feed costs, livestock and fish feed information are not given
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		Yes	
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**				
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	N/A	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**				
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	
			Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	Yes	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	N/A	No deviations
			Are the deviations justified?	N/A	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A	No shortfalls identified
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**				
			Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**				
			Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**				
			Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	
X	**X. References**				
			Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**				
			Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Ireland**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	25 May 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	v2 - 31/10/2010	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Mostly	Commission Decision 2010/93/EU is not mentioned
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	Text not always consistent (3 or 4 partners?). Role of each partner very shortly described.
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	One national coordination meeting held in July 2011. A brief summary of the outcomes is provided.
	B Regional and International coordination			
	B1 Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	36 out of 43 planned. IOTC meetings are missing.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	Non-participation in RCM NS&EA well explained. Reasons for non-attendance to all other meetings are provided by MS. Only explanation for non-attendance to Working Group on Bycatch of Protected Species [WGBYC] (ICES HQ, Feb 1-4) is missing. According to Table III.A.1, Ireland has tuna fisheries, i.e. attendance of RCM LDF would have been relevant.
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	Only two general recommendations of RCM NA listed, other are listed in each technical modules.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION ATLANTIC			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	Recent regulations generated some changes for métiers targeting cod and also for métier OTB_CRU
	B Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Clusters are not named after the biggest segment, as pointed out in the guidelines. It is not clear why clusters are applied (lot of vessels in each segments)
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Clarification is needed : MS should have data collection in 2011 for 2010
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION NORTH ATLANTIC + NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC			
	C Biological métier related variables			
	C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table complete and well detailed by fishing grounds. But inconsistencies in NP 2011-2013 table and so in AR 2011 one (for examples why 3 lines (4,5 and 7) for the same métier in the same area with two of them without achievement in the AR?

		Métiers without objectives planned in NP (example line 95). Some mistakes in column C (year). Sampling strategy (column J) to be more precised (on shore versus at sea). Table difficult to analyse because really applied sampling strategy by MS for some métiers is not clearly comprehensive, especially on shore. Is concurrent sampling really implemented on shore? There are inconsistencies in sampling frame codes. Codes that appear in Table III.C.3 do not exist in Table III.C.4 (e.g. Code S4, S5, SW3)
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	There are inconsistencies in sampling frame codes. Codes that appear in Table III.C.3 do not exist in Table III.C.4 (e.g. Code S4, S5, SW3)
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table complete but several columns were masked. North Sea sampling achievements are not reported. CVs are provided in most of cases. Discrepancies between Table III.C.5 and III.C.3 : trips were sampled in region NS&EA (Table III.C.3), but no results for this region are provided in Table III.C.5.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	There are some inconsistencies. Métiers that appear as sampled in Table III.C.3 are not reflected in Table III.C.6 (e.g. FPO_CRU_0_0_0). On the opposite, métiers sampled in Table III.C.6 do not exist in Table III.C.3 (e.g. OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0).
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Text not following strictly the guidelines and its outlines but understanding. See comments on tables III.C.3 to III.C.6. Achievement rates are OK for métiers concerning NS&EA region (but without results provided on numbers of fish sampled in table III.C.5) and in general mostly when summed at the métier level for NA region (OTB_DEF VIIa, DRB _MOL, TBB_DEF, SSC_DEF, FPO_CRU). 50% of species appear as oversampled in length in NA region. Only sole and plaice are undersampled in Celtic sea and/or Western Ireland.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Reasons explained by métier: Government restrictions, Staff involved in DCF decreasing from year to year, Fleet reduced by national decommissioning programme, Changes in fishing areas, Reallocation of at sea trips to on shore sampling or vice versa.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CVs provided for landings and discards samplings in length and for volumes of discards by species. Methods used are also detailed. Almost all the information given under the section of Data quality is in fact information about achievements and should be reported under this section. Only information about CVs should remain in the section "Data Quality".
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Often yes for retained catches, a little less for discards, only for some species for volumes of discards estimates.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Limits in methods used to calculate CVs. Intensity of sampling too low for several species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	Only RCM NA recommendations are listed. Even if MS fishing activities are of low importance in NS&EA region, MS should also apply RCM NS&EA recommendations.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	For RCM NA recommendations
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC + NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	DCF regulation mentions salmon, sea bass, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the North Atlantic region. MS claimed in its NP and AR that

		eel recreative fishing efforts is vey low but without requesting derogations or giving some results that support this statement. No information about sharks. Information on recreational activities targeting salmon, cod, and sea bass (pilot survey for these last species in 2011) provided.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	No derogation mentioned for eel and sharks.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Justified by low importance of recreational fisheries targeting eel and sharks and no monitoring systems actually in force for these species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Except for eel and sharks.

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	Salmon recreational monitoring well described but no national catch nor quality targets estimates provided.
Were data quality targets met?	NA	Not provided.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Mostly	No derogation has been clearly requested in the NP for eel and sharks, although recreational fishing activities are of very low intensity.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	Eel and sharks not mentioned.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table mostly complete (fishing grounds not filled, with which data could be regional target precision filled? But some biological parameters planned in table III.E.2 are not provided for some species. Precision targets for Crustaceans and Selacians wrong (in fact 12.5%). MS should in future follow guidelines and provide sampling achievements by separate region, even for stocks that overlap into another region
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Herring, blue whiting, monkfish are clearly undersampled so are species fished in VII a.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Explanation why fishing grounds were not provided is given. MS stated that oversampling did not have consequences on the costs. Explanations for specific stocks shortfalls are also provided. MS should seek task sharing for the aging of *Pollachius virens*
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	COST tools used
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Most of CVs did not achieve the precision targets.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Lack of availability of samples. But for some species, more than 2000-4000 individuals were sampled.
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	See general comments

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should complete the paragraph with all the RCM-NA and RCM-NS&EA recommendations. Several ones
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	Because no recommendation was listed. MS should provide proposed actions
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	More by integrating outcomes of WKs on sampling methods than by increasing numbers of samples.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION XXX

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP	Yes	
	NA	

			proposal?	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
F2	**Effort**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes — Improvement with respect to NP
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA — No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
F3	**Landings**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		Yes
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		NA — No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

G	**Research surveys at sea**			This section G applies to all surveys carried out by Ireland — Western IBTS 4th Quarter, Blue whiting survey, Pre-spawning herring acoustic survey, Spawning herring acoustic survey, *Nephrops* UWTV surveys, Irish sea + Aran grounds + Celtic sea
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	N/A
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No — MS should complete the paragraph with all the RCM-NA. AR report did not allow to verify if ad hoc recommendations were clearly followed.
			Are the responsive actions described?	N/A
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Bad weather conditions could be considered as "force majeure" reason.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	Species to be specified
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Clarification is needed : MS should have data collection in 2011 for 2010
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	extraordinary costs net's CV missing
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Careful for the CV for number of enterprises

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Non Probability sampling instead of Census for some variables Clarification is needed : MS should have data collection in 2011 for 2010
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	All indicators are described.
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Information provided by WG / data calls and by species
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	National DB is well described, as quality control, validation and security procedures.
Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	Yes	For national using up to now.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	N/A	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Progress to have access to logbooks and VMS data.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	SGECA and SGRN 2010 recommendations are listed and responses of MS provided.

				Responses to EWG-11-08 comments on AR 2010 are also provided.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	More than a list. It is a glossary!
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	comments on the field "Fishing grounds" in tables III.C
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Mostly	But some old references dealing with DCR. New DCF framework regulations not listed.
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	Maps of the surveys carried out by Ireland and copies of 3 bilateral agreements on métier related variables sampling.

	Member State:	Italy		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	30 May 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	December 2010	
			Answer	EWG COMMENTS
		Overall compliance		
I	General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Mostly	1 NC + 10 partners. Administrative framework and role of the Scientific Committee well described. Some partners have geographical competence at GSA level, others seem to be more transversal, but in general no detail provided on their exact roles.
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	2 national coordination meetings held in 2011. Issues discussed briefly summarized.
B	Regional and International coordination			
	B1 Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	Table complete. MS participated in 34 eligible meetings under the DCF. 45 were planned in the NP. MS attended also extra meetings organized under ICCAT and GFCM umbrellas.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	Complete list of RCM Med&BS 2010 and 2011 recommendations.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	No change mentioned by MS.
B	Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Footnotes have been deleted. Length classes of clustered segments are signaled with a "*" instead of Fleet segments
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Gross value of landings is a transversal variable and should only be given in tables III.F.1. Some variables don't have CV. With non probability sampling MS should provide CV for the observed values
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION Other regions			

III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

A General description of the fishing sector

Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	NA	No change mentioned by MS.

B Economic variables

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Footnotes have been deleted.
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Gross value of landings is a transversal variable and should only be given in tables III.F.1. Other variability estimates should be presented for non random sampling. Achieved sample rate not appropriate for census.

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?		

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	"Appropriate statistical methods" for the estimation of variability and bias of non random sampling are said to be used, but are not described nor presented in the table
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?		

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

C Biological métier related variables

Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete for Mediterranean (no CECAF), including relevant footnotes. Table not really easy to analyse since métiers, sampling frames codes and sampling schemes are sometimes not put in order (GSA 17). Also when total number of trips written in a line is in fact the sum of all the lines relating to one métier. In terms of numbers of trips sampled by métiers, objectives planned are mostly achieved.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete for Mediterranean (no CECAF), including relevant footnotes. "Mostly" achievement rates (11 undersampled métiers, 6 oversampled of a total of 56).
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Table complete with relevant footnotes. But total numbers of individuals measured are wrong (guidelines formula not applied), so it is very difficult to evaluate the achievement rates for each species because the table is confusing between GSA levels and national level. CVs are most of time provided when numbers of fish measured are significant, but only for some species for volumes of discards (35 on 317 "stocks" planned). Regional sampling programmes for large pelagics correctly included in the table.Is it needed for reporting for species not strictly planned in the NP, especially for not frequent species such as Selacians? Providing them in Table III.C.6 would be more accurate.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR	Mostly	Table correctly filled and

		guidelines?	complete (according to AR guidelines) and including relevant footnotes. But inconsistencies with Table III.C.5 in terms of total numbers of fish sampled (for categories unsorted catches, landings and discards). Table III.C.6 seems to provide only species listed in Appendix VII of DCF Decision 2010/93/EU (see for example the low number of Sparidae genus listed).
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly: See comments on Tables III.C.3 to III.C.6. The confusion between information provided by GSAs and total numbers at national level does not allow to really evaluate achievement rates. Table III.C.5 (with the right formula) shows that many stocks (species by GSA) appear oversampled or undersampled.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes: Deficiencies in terms of trips coverage are mainly explained. But no explanations are really provided on the poor consistency between targets planned for the different stocks and the effective numbers of fish measured (both over- and undersampling). MS did not mention if the general oversampling had consequences on the costs.Objectives and results for discards sampling are well described, as well as LPF and Selacians issues.
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly: MS should provide responses to EWG comments.
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly: When numbers of fish measured were consistent for retained catches and discards. Also for volumes of discards but at a lower rate (only for 35 species*GSA).
		Were CV targets met?	Partly: Only for some species for sampling in length. Never for volumes of discards.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes: Sampling intensities should be reviewed and adjusted. Some difficulties for sampling some species (SPF, *Lophius*...) due to seasonality of fishing activities or access to fish.
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA: No derogation mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But several derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some métiers for discards and one for landings. MS NP acceptance by Commission induces that these derogations are granted to MS.
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes: Only RCMs and LM 2010 recommendations are to be listed and commented on. Italy listed recommendations for both 2010 and 2011 years and described its responsive actions including adjustments in its 2012 NP.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
REGION OTHER REGIONS (CECAF and IOTC)			
C	**Biological métier related variables**		
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA: No information provided by MS on CECAF and IOTC regions
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA: No information provided by MS on CECAF and IOTC regions
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA: No information provided by MS on CECAF and IOTC regions
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA: No information provided by MS on CECAF and IOTC regions
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA: Italy stated in its 2011 AR that no sampling action was implemented in 2011. MS is awaiting a

			sampling programme proposal coordinated by RCM LDF. MS is able to provide only transversal data on fishing activities in CECAF region.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA — No action implemented by MS
		Were CV targets met?	NA
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA — No formal derogation requested by MS in its NP 2011-2013 for non-sampling in CECAF region.
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA — Only RCMs and LM 2010 recommendations are to be listed and commented on. Italy listed recommendations of 2011 RCM LDF.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

D	**Recreational fisheries**		
D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes — DCF Decision 2010/93/EU mentions bluefin tuna, eel and sharks as the recreational target species to be sampled in the Mediterranean region. BFT catch is estimated by cross-checking information collected by an overall census on recreational fishing activities and logbooks filled by the fishermen. For eel, the pilot study tested in 2009 was extended with success in 2010 and 2011 in all inland waters with interviews of fishermen. Eel annual average catch per fisherman in inland waters could be estimated. MS should provide data on recreational fisheries on sharks.
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA — No derogation requested by MS in its NP 2011-2013
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly — Lack of information on sharks not explained
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	No — To estimate CVs is too difficult for this type of fisheries.
		Were data quality targets met?	NA
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes — RCM MED&BS derogation on eel in marine waters
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes — MS should provide data on recreational fisheries on sharks.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

E	**Biological stock-related variables**		Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — Table III.E.3 contains 2011 data but reports CV's for 2010 sampling levels. The guidelines request that numbers achieved and CV's are reported for the reference year. Italy is requested to provide CV's based on 2011 data. MS sampled selacians, which were not planned in the NP.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly — Achieved sample rates are hugely oversampled when compared to

				the original 2011 - 2013 NP submission. However it is difficult to properly assess the true level of over or under sampling as the MS has changed its sampling targets but not submitted a revised NP for consideration. Therefore the evaluation process is not valid as there are no updated planned numbers for comparison. However, *Solea vulgaris* is often undersampled. Information on Selacians is provided, while not planned in the NP.
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	No explanation provided in the report on the reasons for the massive over sampling by Italy, up to 4,000% - Sampling designs by GSA complex to achieve, seasonal availability of fish. MS to clarify.
		Are the deviations justified?	No	Over sampling on such a huge scale is not fully explained and the impact on the costs of sampling is also not highlighted. MS to justify the sampling levels and provide details of the financial implications.
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CVs calculated on the basis of 2010 data.
		Were CV targets met?	Partly	Estimates by GSA (as stocks according to GFCM approach) proceed to deficiencies to achieve precision targets, even though species are oversampled (but in 2011).
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	As written in the AR 2011, "Even though there was over-sampling in most cases, the required precision target is hard to achieve". Some difficulties met to find enough samples for some species. No comments on possible consequences of the oversampling on the costs.
		Are the deviations justified?	No	CV's are from 2010 data.
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	Derogation was asked by MS for Mugilidae. MS NP acceptance by EU induces that this derogation was accepted.
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Only RCMs and LM 2010 recommendations are to be listed and commented on.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No action for trying to achieve precision level at the stock level GSA or at larger geographical scale).
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	no actions proposed.
INLAND WATERS - EEL - Specific section III.E.5 of Italian 2011 AR				
E	**E1**	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	Collection of biological data on eel was not planned in 2011 (every three years). And results are not reported in Table III.E.3
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Even though collection was not planned, biological samplings were carried out during the national survey, whose objectives were to collect information on commercial effort and catch in Italian lagoons. Sampling scheme is well described in MS 2011 AR.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	The eel sampling was not planned in the 2011 NP. It is a decision for the Commission if it is appropriate to pay for this additional unplanned sampling or not.
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	

			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Difficulties for collecting data on eel in inland waters well explained by MS.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION OTHER REGIONS (CECAF)					
E	**E1**	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	No information provided for CECAF region, as no sampling activity carried out.
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	MS asked for a derogation for the years 2011-2013 NP.
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	MS NP acceptance by EU induces that this derogation was accepted.
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
			Were CV targets met?	NA	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	Without consequence as no action is carried out by MS.
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F	**Transversal variables**				
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Capacity data quality should not be given. Landings data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks. CV should be given for variables issued from questionnaires. Non probability sampling is used for effort calculation but not referred to in tables B III.1
	F1	**Capacity**			
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mosty	For Other regions, variables were not provided in NP and therefore cannot be compared
			Are the deviations explained?	No	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to clarify
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Capacity data quality should not be given
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	(refers to reports foreseen by national program)
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**			
		F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	CV is not given for some of the fleet segments. For other regions, variables were not provided in NP and therefore cannot be compared.
			Are the deviations explained?	No	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to clarify
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Non probability sampling (a panel) is mentioned in the report, but data quality is not described.
			Are the deviations explained?	No	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to clarify
		F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR

		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	(refers to reports foreseen by national program)
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	There were shortfalls as outlined above, these should be described and actioned.
F3	Landings			
	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Conversion factor is not included in AR, Table III.F.2 is empty. For Other regions, variables were not provided in NP and therefore cannot be compared.
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Italy refers to the fact that they do not use conversion factors as fish are sampled whole. No explanation as to why these variables were not proposed in the NP
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Conversations factor explanation ok.
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Landings data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	AR refers to the fact that all was completed as foreseen in the NP - however landings in "Other Regions" were not foreseen in the NP.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS to clarify.
REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA				
G	Research surveys at sea			MEDITS and MEDIAS surveys
	G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS should state in report which international DB are stored Italian surveys data?
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MEDITS : less days at sea (86%) , but 100% of hauls covered. MEDIAS :Days planned 90 in proposal, but 60 in report and achievement calculated against 60. Nm for achieved target should only include acoustic transecting. Number of targeted hauls planned and achieved should also be included in the NP and national report.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	But MEDITS maps are not readable and don't provided 2011 locations of hauls carried out (maps by GSA should be more informative such as those provided for MEDIAS).
	G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	G4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
IV	Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry			
A	Collection of data concerning the aquaculture			
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	

		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Some aquaculture segments in table IV.A.2 are different from segments on AR text, others are not sampled. MS should explain why.
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No information given in the table
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Data for five segments is not collected, even if foreseen in NP
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	No explanation for missing data
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	No explanation for missing data
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	No	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	It is unclear why data are not already processed.
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	
B		**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV missing
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	CV missing
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	CV missing, not explained
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	CV missing not explained
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V		**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VI		**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Table not completed in NP. No data transmission to ICCAT, SGMOS and Aquaculture data calls.
		Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	
		Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	Yes	Creation in 2011 of a Web platform. No address provided.
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Relates to data transmission failures not being explained
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII		**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	EWG-11-08, EWG-11-18 and EWG-11-19 recommendations are listed and commented on.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		Yes
VIII		**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX		**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	No comments
X		**X. References**		
		Is there a complete list of references?	Mostly	Only old references. Nothing after 2008, when recent MEDITS/MEDIAS reports, RCM MED&BS and PGMED reports, or STECF/EWG reports are cited in

			the AR.
XI	**XI. Annexes**	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	NA	None provided.

	Member State:	**Latvia**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	05-June-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	14-Dec-2012	
		Overall compliance	**Answer**	**EWG COMMENTS**
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Partly	MS states that this is the Technical Report for 2010, also is referring to Commission Decision (2008/605)?
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	Very briefly only
	B Regional and International coordination			
	B1 Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	Only attended meetings listed
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	NA	No non-attendance
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	Only RCM recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Partly	very brief, no indications of changes
	B Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Mostly	Capital costs should not be included in this table
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	REGION Baltic			
	C Biological métier related variables			
	C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Over-sampling of GNS_FWS.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Over-sampling on MS expenses
	C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
		Were CV targets met?	Partly	in 5 of 23 cases
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations asked
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Only RCM recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	

			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Very brief
REGION North Atlantic					
C	Biological métier related variables				
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	achieved number of trips in shrimp fishery was lower
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
			Were CV targets met?	Mostly	in 2 of 3 cases
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations asked
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Only RCM recommendations listed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
REGION CECAF					
C	Biological métier related variables				
	C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Over-sampled
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Over-sampling on MS expenses
	C2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
			Were CV targets met?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?		
	C3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	RCM recommendations and responsive actions are described in text
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	C4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Baltic					
D	Recreational fisheries				
	D1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations from NP mentioned
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Were data quality targets provided?	NA	No targets mentioned
			Were data quality targets met?	NA	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	D3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Mentioned in connection with confirmation of derogation of sampling cod, eel, and salmon by PGRFS
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	D4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No shortfalls identified
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION BALTIC					
E	Biological stock-related variables				
	E1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Over- and under sampling
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	decreased fishery and

		predation in gillnet by seals
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes
	Were CV targets met?	partly
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes; see general comment
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA; no derogations in NP or AR
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described?	yes
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes; Decrease in fishing effort.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

E	**Biological stock-related variables**	
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly; Over- and under sampling
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes
	Were CV targets met?	No
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes; see general comment
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA; no derogations requested
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	mostly; MS should consider participating in RCM
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	mostly; MS should actively seek task sharing with other MS

REGION CECAF

E	**Biological stock-related variables**	
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	mostly; MS should clarify why there is planned sampling in NP but in AR the sampling plan is zero
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No; MS should clarify why there is planned sampling in NP but in AR the sampling plan is zero
	Are the deviations explained?	No
	Are the deviations justified?	NA
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes
	Were CV targets met?	partly
	Are the deviations explained?	no; MS to explain deviations
	Are the deviations justified?	NA; see general comment
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
F	**Transversal variables**	
	Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly; No response rates and achieved sample rates were provided by MS in the table. MS states it is not mandatory for administrative records. Nevertheless, MS should provide rates. CV should be given for landings variables not issued from logbooks or sales notes.
F1	**Capacity**	
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
	Are the deviations explained?	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	NA
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Is respective data quality information given?	No
	Are the deviations explained?	NA
	Are the deviations justified?	NA
F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
F2	**Effort**	

		F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly: CV should be calculated. Effort data quality should be provided in the table when they are not issued from logbooks or sales notes.
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly: For any type of recording system (administrative records?) the outcome must be presented.
		F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
	F3	**Landings**		
		F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA: No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
		F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes: Bad weather
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly: Maps in annex II and not in main body.
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	N/A: No deviations
			Are the deviations justified?	N/A
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes: No relevant recommendations
			Are the responsive actions described?	N/A
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A: No shortfalls identified.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**			
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**			
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Other areas than Baltic are missing
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	N/A	No derogations.
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A	No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Two data calls not submitted.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	In mail correspondence with Commission.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	In mail correspondence with Commission.
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Partly	No relevant recommendation (EWG 11-08 and SGECA 2010) listed from 2010 and 2011.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	No	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Lithuania**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	08-Sep-2010	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Mostly	Commission Decision (2010/93/EU) not mentioned, MS quote this report as Technical Report under DCR, not Annual Report under DCF
II	**National data collection organisation**			
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	Annex II (in Lithuanian)
B	**Regional and International coordination**			
	B1 **Attendance of international meetings**			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	no attendance in WKNARC, WKCPUEFFORT, SGPIDS and Economic Workshop on Statistical Issues…; planned attendance (according to NP) in HAWG, WGBAST, WGEEL and WGECO not mentioned in Table II.B.1
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	general statement about staff limitations
	B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No	For RCM recommendations, MS refers to individual sections and section VII
		Are the responsive actions described?	No	In respective sections and in Section VII
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
A	**General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Partly	very brief
B	**Economic variables**			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Clustered segment should take the name of the largest segment in the cluster (therefore Passive gears : Drift and fixed nets 12-<18 m should be named Passive gears : Drift and fixed nets 10-<12 m)
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	.Capital value, capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in this table. Transversal variables have to be shown in table III.F.1. MS has to explain why CV is always the same for different variables. The CV of the variable " value of quota and other fishing rights " should not be calculated because the collect of this variable is prohibited by the country MS has to respect variables names in the guidelines
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Clustering and the calculation of derived variables is not explained (the former is only explained for the "Other regions segment", see below")
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	CV value cannot be the same for all variables.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were

		issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	

Baltic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Number of planned sea-going and harbour trips has been changed compared to NP (GNS_DEF..; PTM_SPF...)
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Number of individuals planned for length measurements/ageing is different in NP and TR for herring, sprat and cod.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	FPO_CAT_0_0_0: none of 6 planned trips sampled; GNS_DEF_110-156_0_0: only half of the planned trips sampled; PTM_SPF_16-31_0_0: oversampled by 260%
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	not reached for volume of discards
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations asked for
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic 2009 and 2010 recommendations listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	yes	

North Sea and Eastern Arctic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	entries with NAFO fishing grounds should be in the North Atlantic region
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	entries with NAFO fishing grounds should be in the North Atlantic region
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	OTB_CRU_32-69_0_0 in Eastern Arctic not sampled; OTM_DEF_100-119_0_0 and OTB_CRU_40-59_0_0: not sampled due to zero trips in reference year
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	not reached for volume of discards
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations asked
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NS&EA 2009 and 2010 recommendations listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	

Other regions

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	only one métier in the CECAF

		guidelines?	area, SPRFMO métier was inactive in 2011
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes
		Were CV targets met?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA — no derogations
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes — CECAF agreement with NL for 2012-13 mentioned
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
Baltic (= the only relevant region according to NP)			
D	**Recreational fisheries**		
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly — fewer fishermen interviewed than planned; results on eel fishing cannot be fully assessed, as separate document (Annex III) is in Lithuanian (with some labeling of tables and figures in English)
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA — no derogations asked for
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Were data quality targets provided?	No
		Were data quality targets met?	NA
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No — no derogations asked for
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes — RCM Baltic 2009 and 2010 recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No — not clear how MS is going to improve sampling coverage
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
Baltic			
E	**Biological stock-related variables**		
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — There are a lot of inconsistencies between the table III.E.3 of the NP 2011 and the table III.E.3 of the AR 2011: under column M, the n of specimens planned in the NP 2011 and n of specimens planned in the AR is not the same!!! MS should clarify it
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly — eels and herring undersampled; in the NP 2011 are reported different values under column M (Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at a national level) were originally higher (e.g. Eastern Baltic cod: 5000 planned in NP, 1200 'planned' in AR; flounder: 1430 originally planned in NP, 900 'planned' in AR). MS must maintain the number planned and approved by EC in the original submission of the NP
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly — Explanations are given only for eels and herring, MS should provide explanations also for the low number of specimens collected for *G. morhua* and flounder in respect to the number that was planned in the

		NP 2011
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should justify also the low number of specimens collected for *G. morhua* and flounder in respect to the number that was planned in the NP 2011

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should better specify the sentence "Weight of these species is extremely variable" and why was not possible to achieve a good CV for the parameters linked to the weight (for cod and flounder) and to maturity (for sprat)

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogation are present in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic 2010 recommendations listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	MS should explain the inconsistencies between the planned number of specimens in the NP 2011 and the number reported in the AR 2011 (column M)
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	see comment above

North Sea and Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	There are a lot of inconsistencies between the table III.E.3 of the NP 2011 and the table III.E.3 of the AR 2011. MS should resubmit the table of the AR 2011 with the species, area, fishing ground and number of specimens as it was planned in the NP 2011. MS should strictly follow the sampling strategy as reported in the NP (also reporting 0 in the achieved number of samples if is the case!!). Name of the Region and fishing grounds should respect the naming convention and should be consistent between AR and NP. Additional information are welcomed but firstly should be respect what it was planned
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	In the table are not reported the samples of *Sebastes marinus* for the ICES area I, II (MS should report 0 in the table in the case the species has not been sampled)!! No samples of *Pandalus borealis* are reported
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	The text of the AR 2011 is confused, MS should better explain why no samples of both species, planned in the NP, were not collected
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	MS reported CV of species that were not included in the NP, as stated by MS 2011 "….*due to technical errors species mentioned above were not included into sampling plan"*, however are completely missing the CV for the two species planned in the NP (*Sebastes marinus* and *Pandalus borealis*)
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Additional information (i.e. new species that are sampled) is welcomed but firstly should be respected what it was planned. However, the CV achieved for the species that were not planned met the target ones

Are the deviations explained?	Partly	After the resubmission of the table III.E.3, MS is requested to further clarify any deviations
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NS&EA 2009 and 2010 recommendations listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	task-sharing for Northern shrimp sampling sought
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	in the table III.E.3 all the information regarding the North Atlantic Region, as it were planned in the NP 2011, are missing. MS should clarify this issue and provide the necessary information
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	No	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

Other regions

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	There are inconsistencies between the table III.E.3 of the NP 2011 and the table III.E.3 of the AR 2011: in the NP 2011, under column M, the n of specimens planned is reported, whereas missing in the AR. It should be reported and should be the same!!! MS should clarify it. Moreover, in the text of the AR MS reported that for SPRFMO and CECAF "*There were no plans to sample in this region*", checking the NP 2011 table III.E.3, seems that samples in these Regions were planned. Again MS should report the table as it was presented in the NP 2011 and thereafter fulfill it with the samples achieved and eventually justify any deviations
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	1000 individuals per species were planned in NP, in the AR is reported only the n of specimens achieved. It is impossible to verify the consistency of the achievements, MS should adjust the table following the guidelines
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS is requested to better clarify the deviations from the targets. The text of the AR resulted slightly confused and not clear
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Firstly, MS is requested to better clarify the deviations from the targets.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	Only for 4 species/parameters the CV are reported
Were CV targets met?	Partly	For the 4 species mentioned has been achieved the requested targets, is missing

				the CV for the other species
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly	
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should better clarify why was able to collect information on 4 species (at least in the CECAF areas) and not for other 3 species that were planned
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Mostly	as stated by MS the recommendations are listed under module C. Following the guidelines these recommendations should be listed under each module of the AR
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	CECAF sampling agreement with NL since 2012; for SPRFMO area, MS is seeking for cooperation with other MS to share the tasks in biological data collection.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	No response rates and achieved sample rates as well as CVs were provided by MS in the table. MS states it is not relevant. MS to resubmit.
	F1	**Capacity**		
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**		
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F3	**Landings**		
		F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Some transversal parameters are listed in table III.B.3.MS should update III.F.1.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	See above
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
		F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		

		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	BITS: 2 instead of 3 days, but no. of hauls achieved
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?		
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	Maps in annex and not in main body.
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**			
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	No data collection
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**			
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	achieved sample rate/ planned sample rate are miscalculated
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	CV has not be filled by "NA" instead by "0". MS has to explain the reference year (2008 or 2010)
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	In AER, the formula concerning the standard table IV B.2 refers to the number of vessels instead the number of firms
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Indicators 1-4 for other region than Baltic should be indicated with a "No" in the data collection column in table as well as indicator 8 from "Other regions".
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	RCM Baltic and NS&EA missing; invalid/unclear

			acronyms: STECF SGECA, SGMOS, "EPofEUS" and "WGFERE"? (MS should refer to STECF EWG 11-__)
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	some WGs missing, see above
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Partly	very brief description, progress not clear
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	No mentions about progress of national databases in AR.
	Are the deviations explained?	Parly	Extensive time consumption of digitalization of data given as reason for deviation
	Are the deviations justified?	No	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	but only on delays in data transmission
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	No solution given for problems with national databases.
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Partly	MS should list all relevant (EWG 11-08, SGECA 2010) recommendations from 2010 and 2011. The listing format should be more easily readable.
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X X. References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI XI. Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	**Malta**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	25 May 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	January 2011	
			Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
		Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	**National data collection organisation**			
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	Only one institute involved in DCF work
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	NA	No formal coordination meetings organised (one institute)
B	**Regional and International coordination**			
	B1 **Attendance of international meetings**			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	GFCM SPF assessment WG not mentioned
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Partly	Malta did not participate in important GFCM planned meetings on stocks assessments or DCF planned WKs on sampling methods. Reasons are not really provided, MS must give some explanations.
	B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
A	**General description of the fishing sector**			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Mostly	
B	**Economic variables**			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	CV is missing for five segments. MS has to justify these missing in the annual report (very small sample…)
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Changes in the elements that compose maintenance costs and value of investments
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Data quality of census data with low response rate (equivalent to non probability sampling) cannot be fully judges because other indicators of variability are not provided
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
C	**Biological métier related variables**			Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables
	C1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Most of the métier codes are not following RCM references.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CVs column empty. Taking into consideration the explanation in the text, MS should calculate the CVs by combining data from the country/countries with whom the

			stocks are shared.
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	More fish reported to be sampled in Table III.C.5 (24369) than in Table III.C.6 (23964). Why?
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	See comments on Tables III.C.3 to III.C.6. MS should adjust the numbers of fish to be measured with levels of achievement registered. Doing that, regular oversampling observed will be avoided. As mentioned in AR, oversampling did not occur "considerable" extra costs.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Oversampling in numbers of trips and changes between at sea and on-shore samplings well explained. Oversampling in numbers of fish measured is also explained.
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	No	Neither for retained catch length measurements, nor discards ones and volumes of discards
	Were CV targets met?	NA	No CVs provided
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	CVs can only be estimated at regional level (LPF agreement, shared métiers).
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Regarding the numbers of fish most of time oversampled, CVs might be calculated at national level to adjust the next years sampling designs.
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation mentioned in AR. MS dealt in its NP of attention on some no frequent species in national waters such as eel, anchovy and sardine.
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Only RCMs and LM 2010 recommendations are to be listed and commented on.
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
D	**Recreational fisheries**		
D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No real proof of no recreational fisheries targeting sharks. Explanation needed about shark fishing. Bluefin tuna OK.
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	Derogation for eel
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	Explanation about shark fishing needed.
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
	Were data quality targets met?	NA	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?		
D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Eel derogation
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
E	**Biological stock-related variables**		
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	No quantitative CVs provided (only report as a level i.e. Level 1, 2 or 3). MS should clearly report the CV% obtained. Under column O: "Achieved precision target (CV)" states Not applicable in many cases - why is this? MS to provide CV's expressed as a % for all stocks sampled. For several stocks no planned sampling numbers are provided in the table, with the consequence that over and under sampling cannot be evaluated.

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	No planned numbers are reported in some cases. Most of the planned species are achieved or oversampled. Only Istiophoridae and *Raja miraletus* have not been sampled as planned.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Sampling was completed on a number of stocks which were not planned and where the numbers sampled are extremely low. These were as a result of on board observers and surveys. The same explanation was applied to cases of oversampling which were at National expense.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Malta is collecting data for more species than claimed by a strict application of the DCF regulation.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	No % CVs provided - Malta provides a small number of CV's expressed as Level 1, 2 or 3. MS is requested to provide CV's expressed as a % for all parameters.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Partly for hake, *nephrops* and pink shrimp
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	As written in the AR 2011, "Even though there was over-sampling in most cases, the required precision target is hard to achieve". As already mentioned it is not clear if the target precision has been reached for all the species.
Are the deviations justified?	No	Ms required to report CV as a % for all parameters.

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	None requested in NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Have listed RCM recommendations from 2008 - 2011. Only RCMs and LM 2010 recommendations and actions are required.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Very generic response on trying to improve sampling design and the resulting data quality.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Capacity data quality should not be given(CV is applicable for census) nor effort or landings data quality when they are issued from logbooks or sales notes

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	NA	Capacity data quality should not be given
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

F2 Effort

F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	NP included also survey as a data source for days at sea and hours fished. This survey is referenced in the AR but no results are reported. MS is requested to provide the results of this survey.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	Not possible to evaluate as the survey results are not provided.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to provide survey results.

F22 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Effort data quality should not be given as they are issued from logbooks or sales notes, but achieved sampling rate for the surveys is not disclosed (unless it

		was 100% for all items)
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to supply sample rates from survey.

F23 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations are already included in the AR
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

F24 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Refers to what Malta currently does
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	Where there are shortfalls - actions should be described.

F3 Landings

F31 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F32 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Landings data quality should be given as they are issued from logbooks
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F33 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations are already included in the AR
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

F34 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

G Research surveys at sea

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

		MEDITS and MEDIAS surveys
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MEDITS : less days at sea , but 98% of hauls covered. MEDIAS : the achieved target is 88%, due to one day at sea missing. 10 Nm planned in NP, but 300 in AR and achievement calculated against 300. Number of targeted hauls planned and achieved should also be included in the NP and AR.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Bad weather for MEDIAS survey
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Mostly	MEDITS OK but MEDIAS biological sampling was too low which could cause impairment of the quality indices.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Bad weather for MEDIAS survey
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	No relevant recommendation by LM.
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	To complete MEDIAS sampling by MEDITS samples for SPF.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	Latin names are missing
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	MS has to give more details
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	
B		**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**		
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	MS has to give more details
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	
V		**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations presented in AR
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VI		**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Not consistent with guidelines in terms of description of species and fleet segments - "use the Latin name for the species and the name of the fleet segment foreconomic variables". More than one GFCM data calls missing, e.g., WG Demersal GFCM.
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table not completed in NP
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	No	Very short and no detailed on this issue
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	No precise information provided on DB development and software / tools available.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII		**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
		Are the relevant SGRN recommendations listed?	Yes	Only 2010 and 2011 recommendations are to be listed and commented on.
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII		**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX		**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	No comments
X		**X. References**		
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI		**XI. Annexes**		
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	NA	No annex

Member State:	**The Netherlands**		
	Reference year	2011	
	Version of the AR reviewed	version 'f1' of 30 May 2012	
	Version of the NP proposal	version 6 of 14 Feb 2011	
		Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
	Overall compliance		
I General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II National data collection organisation			
A National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	plus Annex 5 in Dutch
B Regional and International coordination			
B1 Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	provided list is not the last version of the reference list, some workshops missing (e.g. WKNARC, WKMSHS, WKAREA-2)
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	very few not attended as planned
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	Section VII!
SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
B Economic variables			
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes Mostly	Clustering with segment from other supraregion not included in the table. According to the AR text, NL clustered the "other region" vessel with the "NSEA" supraregion. If that is the case, MS should indicate clustering of "other region" vessel also in table IIIB2, not only in the text.
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	MS should follow footnote a) , i.e. capacity, effort and capital value are not to be reported here. MS did not use the template for IIIB3, the terminology in the fleet segment gear column is not consistent with guidelines.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Does not explain that "other regions" vessels are clustered with this supraregion, or the methodology for capital value and cost calculation. Does not refer to achievements with respect to the NP, but tables nevertheless reflect some improvements
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No significant deviations detected
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes Mostly	Values for the calculation of derived variables are not given. Information on the methods and assumptions made for the estimation of FTE is not complete (e.g. annual number of working hours not provided).
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Lower precision levels. Achieved sample rates are quite low for some fleet segments, no explanation given.
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines

		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
SUPRA-REGION Other regions			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**		
A	**General description of the fishing sector**		
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	
B	**Economic variables**		
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No — Clustering with other supraregion is not shown
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No — Only one vessel but information on data collection should still be provided
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes — Tables of NP do not include this supraregion. Text of AR states that achievements are in accordance with NP
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes No — Information should be presented also in table IIIB3, not only in the text.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA — No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA No
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
North Sea & Eastern Arctic			
C	**Biological métier related variables**		
	C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes — Comment in Dutch in column R (Achieved number of trips) line 14; métier 'all demersal': 240 trips (Table III.C.4) or 244 trips (Table III.C.5) sampled?
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — Column S (Achieved no of fish measured at a national level by métier) is empty; no CVs on discards; CVs for length/age sampling from landings given in few cases
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly — Métier codes partly deviate from conventions
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly — SSC_DEF_70_99_0_0: only half of the planned trips sampled; TBB_CRU_16-31_0_0 and FYK_CAT_0_0_0: 74-75% of planned trips sampled; métier 'GNS_DEF_0_0_0' oversampled by 330%; métier 'all demersal' oversampled by >200%
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
		Were CV estimates provided?	Partly — no CVs on discards; CVs for length/age sampling from landings given in few cases
		Were CV targets met?	Partly — in half of the provided cases
		Are the deviations explained?	Partly — problems with Table III.C.5 in general addressed, CV deviations as such not addressed
		Are the deviations justified?	Partly — not clear why CVs could not be calculated in cases where the no. of fish was sufficiently high
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes — not here, but in section VII

Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

North Atlantic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	15 instead of 10(12) trips sampled at sea
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Column S (Achieved no of fish measured at a national level by métier) is empty; no CVs on discards; CVs for length/age sampling from landings given in 2 cases only
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	15 instead of 10(12) trips sampled at sea
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	no CVs on discards; CVs for length/age sampling from landings given in 2 cases only
Were CV targets met?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	CV deviations not addressed
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

Other regions

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	derogation
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	not here, but in section VII
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	will be sampled in 2012-13
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

North Sea & Eastern Arctic (= the only relevant region according to NP)

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Results of 2010-2011 study published in separate report.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	

Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	also in section VII
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	to take potential estimation bias into account
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	some CVs missing
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	*Clupea*, *Nephrops* and T*rachurus* are undersampled (<50%)
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should specify the undersample of *Trachurus trachurus* specimens
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	see comment above

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	only few CVs are reported
Were CV targets met?	Partly	On 35 CV estimations provided, only 17 reached the requirement targets
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should provide explanations why CV has not been provided for all the species/parameters listed in the table III.E.3

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should provide actions to avoid shortfalls also for *T. trachurus*

North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Only few CVs are reported, moreover MS should fulfill the column named "MS participating in sampling"
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Only herring in VIa was undersampled (<50%)
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	only few CVs reported
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Only 4 CV reached the required estimations. MS should provide the missing CV or justified the absence of the calculations
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should provide actions to avoid shortfalls for all the species/parameters listed in the table III.E.3

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should list all the recommendations from RCM endorsed by LM (e.g. RCM NA recommends MS to forward to stock coordinators all their available data issued from the DCF, including stock-related variables such as growth, sex-ratio and maturity….)
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	see comment above
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

Other regions

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	MS asked a derogation for sampling in other Region (CECAF)
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	

		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS explained why no activity has been carried out in the Region (CECAF)
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	MS should mention the relevant derogation in this section (even if it is mentioned also in section III.C of the AR)
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should mention the relevant recommendations in this section (even if it is mentioned in other sections of the AR)
		Are the responsive actions described?	No	MS should mention the responsive actions in this section (even if it is mentioned in other sections of the AR)
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No recommendations are mentioned
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	sampling in CECAF area is planned for 2012-13
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	F1	**Capacity**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**		
	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	Listed deviation from NP is covered by a derogation
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F3	**Landings**		
	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	(when price for some trips is not available, it is estimated from available prices)
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls		

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

G Research surveys at sea

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Beam Trawl Survey: 84%(days)/80%(hauls) achievement
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	Maps in annex and not in main body.

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	N/A	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	N/A	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	Species to be specified (e.g. *Salmo salar*)
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Segments with zero population should not be presented. IV.A.1 indicates the existence of „other marine fish ", but IV.A.2 does not reflect this. MS to clarify.
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	"other marine fish" aquaculture indicated, but not provided in table IVA3, Abbrev.:"na" to be clarified and justified

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Population provided in the AR is different from NP; to be clarified by MS
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Abbrev.:"na" to be clarified and justified
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV has to be provided in case of probability sampling scheme

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Missing CV in table IV.B.2
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Clarification needed why CV has "not been collected from Central Bureau of Statistics"
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	Yes	
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	The relevant LM recommendations are mentioned using the rec. nr. but the rec. nr. is not to be find in the list of recommendations. (only ref. to section in AR).
	Are the deviations justified?	N/A	
2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	minor problems with database
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	detailed Section VII
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	on recommendations, conflicts with Table III.C.5 etc.
X	**X. References**		
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Compliance class	Compliance level
No	<10%
Partly	10-50%
Mostly	50-90%
Yes	>90%
NA	not applicable

Member State: **Poland**

Reference year	2011	
Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2012	
Version of the NP proposal	31 May 2012	
Overall compliance	**Answer**	**EWG COMMENTS**
I General framework		
Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II National data collection organisation		
A National correspondent and participating institutes		
Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	Not clear if coordination meeting took place (was planned in NP)
B Regional and International coordination		
B1 Attendance of international meetings		
Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes	
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations		
Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
SUPRA-REGION XXXX		
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector		
A General description of the fishing sector		
Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	
B Economic variables		
Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Clustered segments should be signaled by an asterisk in this table
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV should be presented for all variables,(an analysis of the representativeness of the data is given, but CV has to be calculated until a better solution is met, as requested in PGECON).
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Methods for estimation of capital value are not fully presented. Clustering scheme has changed without further explanation.
Are the deviations explained?	No	A lot more clustering has taken place, including adding new segments to differently planned clusters and the explanation in the report does not match with the table.
Are the deviations justified?	No.	MS should explain why clustering scheme had to be changed
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
Baltic		
C Biological métier related variables		
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR	Yes	

		guidelines?		
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	most of the métiers/sampling frames undersampled, two not sampled at all
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	mostly explained with major unexpected changes in fishery pattern
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
		Were CV targets met?	Mostly	apart from one stock achieved for lengths/ages, not achieved for volume of discards
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	derogations not asked
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM Baltic 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	MS emphasizes the need to adjust sampling scheme according to fishing spatial and temporal distribution
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
North Sea and Eastern Arctic				
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
	C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	only one métier: GHL fisheries off East Greenland (1 trip planned, not sampled)
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	fishery not conducted in 2011
		Are the deviations justified?		
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	NA	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	no derogations asked for
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NS&EA 2010 recommendation
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
Other regions				
C	**Biological métier related variables**			
	C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	1 trip both in the CECAF and SPRFMO area
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	No	
		Were CV targets met?	NA	

		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	age reading data not available before AR submission
		Are the deviations justified?		
	C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations asked
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM LDF 2010 and 2011 recommendations listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
Baltic (= the only relevant region according to NP)				
D	**Recreational fisheries**			
	D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	Sampling of eel recreational fisheries is a subject for derogation (Polish NP 2011-2013). Eel recreational fishing is investigated within the framework of the Polish Eel Management Plan following Council Regulation 1100/2007. Not clear if derogation was granted.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	minor deviation in no. of sampled trips
		Are the deviations justified?		
	D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
		Were data quality targets met?	NA	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	RCM Baltic 2010 and 2011 recommendations missing
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	internal financing issues
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
Baltic				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	salmon, Western Baltic cod and herring undersampled; Eastern Baltic cod and plaice oversampled by >200%
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	changes in fishing patterns (*cf.* section III.C)
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
		Were CV targets met?	No	Only in very few cases.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	see general comment
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations according to NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	no	Only 1 RCM Baltic 2011 recommendation listed. MS should consider and list the other recommendations from RCM Baltic
		Are the responsive actions described?	partly	Only 1 RCM Baltic 2011 recommendation listed. MS should consider and list the other recommendations from RCM Baltic
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	partly	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	mostly	MS must ensure it adjusts sampling

				as suggested in AR
North Sea and Eastern Arctic				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Were CV estimates provided?	NA
			Were CV targets met?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA; see general comment
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	partly; only 2 RCM NS&EA 2011 recommendations listed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	no; MS should describe in more detail actions planned
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
Other regions				
E	**Biological stock-related variables**			
	E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
	E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Were CV estimates provided?	No
			Were CV targets met?	NA
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes; data not available before AR submission
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly; MS should ensure data are available on time. See general comment.
	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes; RCM LDF 2011 recommendation listed
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
F	**Transversal variables**			
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly; CV should be given for landings variables not issued from logbooks or sales notes. Response rate should be given for census, as census data not always has a 100% response rate. Data has to be collected from all segments, despite their small size (see report text on landings data for small segments)
	F1	**Capacity**		
		F1 1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes; Although data were collected for the entire population the outcomes should be presented in table IIIF1
			Are the deviations explained?	NA; see above
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F1 2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes
			Are the deviations explained?	NA
			Are the deviations justified?	NA
		F1 3 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA

			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F2	Effort				
	F1 1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	(additional analysis of the quality of the soaking time estimation could be given)
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F1 2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F1 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F1 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F3	Landings				
	F1 1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Values are missing for 64% of passive gear under 10m
	F1 2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Data quality for small segments is estimated from other segments data, Values are missing for 64% of passive gear under 10m
			Are the deviations explained?	yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Values are missing for 64% of passive gear under 10m
	F1 3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F1 4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	Research surveys at sea				
G1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	The nautical mile and fish hauls targets and achievements should be presented in separate lines to evaluate achievement. Hydrological stations planned and achieved should not be presented in this table as this is not eligible for DCF funding
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Planned targets slightly different in NP and AR
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Mostly	Maps should be included in the main body of annual report and not in annex
G2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal				
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
G3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations				

		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**			
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**			
		Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	Where is the Polish trout and carp production, even if not surveyed?
		Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	**Yes**	
		Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	**Yes**	
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Description of "actions to avoid shortfalls" should only refer to the future.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**			
		Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information on indicator "No of enterprises" is missing.
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Coverage rate in terms of employment and turnover may be reported to assess data collected in comparison to the whole sector.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	None
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	None
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	No shortfalls, action described belongs to actions taken in the reporting year. This is not asked for, but ok. Next report only action for the future should be described.
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	RCMs missing; MS is one of the few that listed data transmission to the 3 economic workshops. Need to use Latin names for species and details of fleet segments for economic data
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table not completed in NP

	Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?	No	details on database development and on processing, analysis and estimation of the parameters missing
	Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A)?	NA	Is not clear if a national DCF website is ready. MS to clarify
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	No targets set in NP which makes it difficult to evaluate against achievement in AR.
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations according to MS. See data deficiency listed by JRC/ICES
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	improvements for FishFrame upload needed
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	only EWG 11-08 recommendations listed
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	
X X. References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI XI. Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	Portugal		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	31 May 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	21 Dec 2010	
			Answer	EWG COMMENTS
		Overall compliance		
I	General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II	National data collection organisation			
	A National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	1 NC and 5 partners, whose roles are detailed.
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	2 coordination meetings held. Details on their subjects are very briefly detailed.
	B Regional and International coordination			
	B1 Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	MS should report attendance using the official table of DCF eligible meetings. Some meetings are missing in Table II.B.1 provided by MS, especially economic ones. 6 non-attendances compared to planned meetings but several extra participations at national expense in other ICCAT meetings.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Mostly	Budgetary constraints. Some details provided on otolith exchange for black spot sea bream between Portugal and Spain.
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Partly	No general recommendations of RCMs or LM listed. Other recommendations provided in the relevant sections of the AR.
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	SUPRA-REGION ATLANTIC			
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
	A General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	No changes in 2011, except the decreasing landings of skipjack tuna (decreased by around 8000 t) in the Azores area.
	B Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Clustering of segments is not described
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	Some STECF recommendations included, already covered by the AR Guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC			
	C Biological métier related variables			
	C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total no. of trips in 2011 missing. Targets planned in NP (concurrent at sea only) well achieved.
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Total number of trips in 2011 missing. Targets planned in NP (concurrent at sea only) well achieved.
		Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete and consistent with AR guidelines. Only 2 species planned in NP

		2011-2013 with quantified objectives. Those are achieved.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete. Table III.C.6 is consistent with table III.C.5 (same species). By implementing concurrent sampling at sea, no other by catch or species sampled before being discarded? For example MS mentioned haddock as a target species of métier OTB_DEF_>=120_0_0.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Achievement levels are good in terms of numbers of trips sampled and numbers of fish measured. As sampling is performed at sea on unsorted catch and during long trips, comments on undersampling or oversampling are not relevant, as sampling achievement is only depending of the catch composition. But no data collected on other species than those planned in the NP caught during the hauls sampled. Is it really concurrent sampling at sea?
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CV's reported for all the species planned in the NP.
Were CV targets met?	Yes	Target precisions are achieved for all the species planned in the NP.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation requested in the NP 2011-2013 for NS&EA.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NS&EA 2009, 2010 and 2011 recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	For better coverage of the concerned fleets, MS tries to include vessels not sampled before in its annual sampling programme.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total number of trips in 2011 missing for mainland and NAFO. Targets in numbers of trips planned in NP are achieved, except for towed gears métiers (OTB_DEF, OTB_CRU, TBB_CRU) in Iberian waters (IXa), pots an fyke nets in IXa, and netting in sub-area X (Azores).
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Same comments as for Table III.C.3. But potting targeting octopus in IXa appears as sampled at the right level.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table consistent with AR guidelines. But CVs on discards not provided (neither for length structures nor for volumes). About 50% were undersampled, but target precision of landings or unsorted catches are achieved. In Azores (sub-area X), objectives planned in numbers of fish to be measured are achieved for 50% of the species (8 on 16).
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete. Table III.C.6 is consistent with Table III.C.5. Information on other species than those reported in Table III.C.5 is provided.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Targets in numbers of trips planned in NP are achieved except for pots and fykes nets and for towed gears (OTB and TBB) in IXa and for gillnetters in X. Concerning length sampling of landings, even when species are undersampled (16 on 34 for mainland and NAFO), CVs were achieved. In Azores (sub-area X), objectives planned in numbers of fish to be measured are achieved for 50% of the species (8 on 16).
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Deviations are clearly identified by MS in its AR. Explanations are provided by métier (smalls vessels are polyvalent, mixture of mesh sizes used by netters, no access to landings for some towed gears métiers because fish are already sold before to be landed). No additional costs when métiers are oversampled.

		Clear explanations are also provided in case of over- or undersampling of species mentioned in Table III.C.5.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CV's reported for the majority of species planned in the NP but only for landings in mainland and NAFO. No CVs for discards (length structures and volumes).
Were CV targets met?	Yes	Even when species are undersampled, CVs provided for landings and unsorted catches achieved target precisions.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	CVs provided by MS for mainland métiers concerned only the métiers of group OTB_CRU and OTB_DEF. The high variability found in catch sorting procedures, fishing effort and gears used did not allow calculating CVs for passive gears métiers and for discards.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation requested in the NP 2011-2013 for NA.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NA 2009, 2010 and 2011 recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	In the 'mainland' area, MS is considering several sampling schemes to improve on-board sampling (despite of the reluctance of fishermen), self-sampling and better identification of the métiers which are sampled. In the Azores area, help by sub-contracting sampling at sea and improving access to landings of netters will reduce shortfalls.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION OTHER REGIONS (ICCAT, CECAF, IOTC)

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Total number of trips in 2011 missing for ICCAT and IOTC regions. Targets in numbers of trips planned in NP are generally achieved for the two regions. But in CECAF, 5 métiers (on a total of 7 and targeting demersal species or SPF) were undersampled and the two others (targeting LPF) highly oversampled.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table mostly fulfilled. Same comments as for Table III.C.3.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table consistent with AR guidelines. No sampling at all in CECAF region. Objectives planned for ICCAT and IOTC regions achieved and even often with oversampling. Except for skipjack tuna (see section III.A). CVs are provided for landings and discards length structures but no CVs for volumes of discards.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete, except for CECAF region (no data as no sampling). Table III.C.6 is consistent with table III.C.5. Information on other species than those reported in Table III.C.5 is provided.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Targets in numbers of trips planned in NP are achieved in ICCAT and IOTC regions, but most of the métiers are undersampled in CECAF except those targeting LPF. Concerning length sampling, most of the species are sampled as planned or oversampled, except in CECAF where no reporting on 2011 results is provided. it is difficult to understand why because trips were sampled according to table III.C.3. MS should clarify.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Deviations are clearly identified by MS in its AR. Explanations are provided by métier (landings of swordfish in Spain for LLD_LPF, volumes of landing depending of weather conditions...). Discrepancies between standard tables (empty) and AR text where MS wrote that Tables III.C.5 and III.C.6 were filled for the CECAF area. MS underlined also that there are no additional costs when métiers are oversampled.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	CV's concerning unsorted catch or landings and discards length structures are reported for the majority of species planned in the NP when numbers of fish were sufficient to calculate them (ICCAT and IOTC). But no CVs provided on volumes of discards.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Target precision is not achieved except for some tuna species.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	The wide size range of the catch and the change of the size classes (5cm to 2cm as requested by RFMOs) are the reasons given by MS for obtaining high CVs for LPF. Difficulties met to raise data collected on board to the fleet level did not allow calculating CVs for discards.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation requested in the NP 2011-2013 for Other regions.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM LDF 2010 and 2011 recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Re-evaluation of sampling designs concerning long trips in ICCAT and IOTC regions, increasing of the sampling effort at the tuna main landing places in Azores area, implementation of the annual plan of observers as soon as budget constraints will be solved in CECAF.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGIONS NORTH ATLANTIC AND CECAF

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	DCF Decision 2010/93/EU mentions salmon, sea bass, eel and sharks as target species to be sampled in the North Atlantic region. No DCF requirement for CECAF area. MS carried out in 2010 a pilot study on sea bass in mainland. No progress was possible in 2011 to estimate the population of fishermen targeting this species and only a survey covering maritime touristic operators was performed. First results from this study pointed to low quantities of sea bass catches.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	It is not clear if budgetary constraints have impacted the actions planned in the NP. MS provided no information about the other species which should be monitored (eel, salmon, sharks).
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	no explanations for eel, salmon and sharks

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	Fishing declarations system did not work in 2011.
Are the deviations justified?		

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	RCM NA recommendation on eel derogation in marine waters not listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	One recommendation of RCM NA 2010.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Implementation of an online survey on DGPA website.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete. The two species planned in the NP were largely oversampled (by observers on-board) and target precisions are achieved. Otoliths collected for ALKs but were not read in 2011.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	It is recommended that a cost - benefit analysis is carried out by Portugal in collaboration with the RCM to confirm if it

		is sensible to continue sampling these fleets, where such a huge effort in terms of cost and staff time is spent for what appears to be very little return in terms of data. See comments Table III.E.3. In addition, no maturity data is collected for this region.
Are the deviations explained?	No	No explanations provided on why age readings did not occur. MS to clarify.
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	Explanation ok for oversampling but need explanation for not undertaking age reading and for not completing maturity sampling.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	For all parameters except for length@age.
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Yes for the CV's provided (3 out of 5 parameters)
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	No	No reason given why Portugal is not reading otoliths collected.

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations requested for 2011 in the NP.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Only one recommendation of RCM-NS&EA 2009 listed. Are there relevant recommendations from the RCM NS &EA 2010, or 2011 which should have been actioned? MS to clarify.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	But only for one recommendation of RCM-NS&EA 2009.
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	The MS says they actioned the recommendation of the RCM 2009 regarding maturity sampling, however Portugal did not complete any maturity sampling in this area. MS to clarify.

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	For better coverage of the concerned fleets, MS tries to include vessels not sampled before in its annual sampling programme.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table mostly complete. CVs not provided for some parameters such as ALKs or for sub-area X (Azores).
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Numbers of fish planned generally achieved in length, but some species undersampled in NAFO area. Selacians in mainland are also undersampled.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	The breakdown by fishing grounds planned by MS could entail difficulties to sample all the fish planned in the NP. Explanations on deviations are also detailed by MS for most important species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Partly	CV's reported for 63 of the 159 parameters sampled. See comments on table III.E.3 (ALKs, Azores).
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	When calculated. It is the case for maturity@length, sex-ratio@length, even when the species were lightly undersampled..
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Major problems are found to cover the entire range sizes of the catch for each species. No explanations given by MS on why no ALKs at all could be provided in 2011. MS to clarify
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Apart from the issue with age@length which requires an explanation.

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations were requested in the NP for 2011.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM-NA 2009, 2010 and 2011 recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Proposals for improving sampling of eel and crustaceans. But nothing on MS age reading capacities.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	concerning eel and crustaceans ok but need details regarding age reading programme.

REGION OTHER REGIONS (ICCAT, CECAF, IOTC)

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table only filled up for ICCAT and IOTC regions. Empty for CECAF discrepancies between the table and the AR text in which comments are provided on actions carried out!). CVs not provided for some parameters such as ALKs or for sub-area X (Azores).
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Numbers of fish planned generally achieved in length, but some species undersampled in ICCAT area. Only weight@length and sex-ratio@length was planned in the NP. Objectives 2011 are achieved except in CECAF.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Difficulties to have access to fish not gutted. Fish landed directly on board a factory vessel or in places where they are immediately transported. MS should clarify what was exactly done in CECAF region.
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	no explanation on the delay in providing age readings.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	Yes for all the species sampled in ICAAT and IOTC regions.
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Target precision is generally achieved for tuna but less for sharks and swordfish.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	The wide size range of the catch and the change of the size classes (5cm to 2cm as requested by RFMOs) are the reasons given by MS for obtaining high CVs for LPF.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations were requested in the 2011 NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	RCM for Long distance fisheries took place for the second time in 2011. There are possibly some recommendations from the 2010or 2011 meetings which are relevant. MS to clarify.
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Ms proposes to conduct a bigger sampling effort towards the métier LLD_LPF and to ask for access on board the factory vessel for sampling.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION XXX

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	NP guidelines set capacity at fleet register figures for 1st of January, and not any vessel active during the year
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

F2 Effort

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Just in relation to the effort to sample the less than 10m vessels by métier. But the MS appears to be able to report on all the necessary parameters for effort for <10m and >10m vessels.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR

		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F3	Landings			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	details for 2 of the landings variables are missing. MS requested to update table III.F.1
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to update with missing variables.
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	For the parameters presented, but not available for the missing parameters
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS to update the text and tables for III.F.1 to provide missing parameters.

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

G	Research surveys at sea		This section G applies to all surveys carried out by Portugal in 2011	Flemish Cap Groundfish Survey (FCGS in cooperation with Spain), Sardine and Anchovy Acoustic Survey (SAHMAS), Sardine DEPM (triennial), Western IBTS 4th Quarter (W-IBTS-Q4), *Nephrops* UWTV surveys offshore Portugal (FU 28-29)
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	W-IBTS-Q4 and SAHMAS surveys: objectives planned achieved. FCGS survey: 6 days more than planned but only 65% of the hauls were carried out. Sardine DEPM: 4 days at sea missing but scientific programme achieved. *Nephrops* UWTV FU 28-29 survey: 3 days at sea missing, 64% hauls, 0% TV tracks.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	FCGS survey: malfunction of the fishing gear forced to stop the survey for 2 weeks for repair purposes. Sardine DEPM: bad weather conditions. *Nephrops* UWTV survey: technical failure on vessel's engine motives the lower number of days at sea. Technical problems for implementing TV method due to the depth of the stations and vessel breakdown I two consecutive years.
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Two consecutive years of vessel breakdown could imply insufficient maintenance.
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	MS wrote in its AR that the quality of the surveys was not impacted by the deviations registered in 2011. Scientific programme was achieved for all the surveys, even though it was at a minimum level for some of them.
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	"Force majeure" cases for gears and engine damages and bad weather conditions. MS proposed to stop collection of images by TV and carried out the *Nephrops* survey only with trawling

		stations (submitted to SGNEPS 2012 for evaluation).
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Partly	IV.A.1 contains wrong information in the species column
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Achieved sample rate presented wrongly, CV missing for response rates < 70%

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Population provided in the AR is different from NP; AR text states 2010 data, tables reflect 2009; to be clarified by MS
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	CV missing for response rates < 70%
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some variables are missing.

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Variables missing, reference year 2009, in the report 2010 is mentioned.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Achieved sample rate and response rate are provided in table IV_B_1, but not in table IV_B_2.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Information on Indicators 5, 6 and 7 (requesting access to VMS data) and 9 (fuel efficiency of fish capture) not provided.
Were the relevant derogations listed?	Partly	Derogation was granted to MS for indicators 5 to 7 for the years 2009 and 2010. No derogation provided for the period 2011-2013.

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	No explanations given for indicators 5 to 7. MS should clarify. Ms detailed in its AR the method used for calculating the indicator 9. It is applied up to now only for vessels >10m. Budgetary constraints did not allow covering small-scale vessels.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	Only acceptable for indicator 9.

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information provided by WG / data calls and by species. No information given for No dataset sent in response to data call on the processing industry? MS has to clarify if missing information is due to incomplete filling in the table or due to incomplete submission of data.
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Mostly	National DB and actions carried out are (too) briefly described.

	Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Development of the Central DB for Data collection could not progress in 2011 as planned in the NP.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Budgetary constraints did not allow carrying out all the 2011 actions planned in the NP.
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations			
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	Only some SGRN 2010 are listed. No recommendations from SGECA and EWG-11-08 on evaluation of AR 2010.
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly	more detail required for follow-up actions
VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations			
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections			
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	None provided.
X X. References			
	Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI XI. Annexes			
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	6 annexes provide on the methods used for calculating CVs, the first results of a pilot study on glass eel and on métiers targeting skates in IXa, questionnaires used for skates survey and self-sampling, and a methodological document on the economic survey of the fishing fleet.

Member State:	**Romania**		
	Reference year	2011	
	Version of the AR reviewed	31-May-2012	
	Version of the NP proposal	20-Dec-2010	
		Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
	Overall compliance		
I General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	
II National data collection organisation			
A National correspondent and participating institutes			
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	In this section, there is no mentioning of a National Coordination meeting. MS should clarify this issue, because in the chapter VI is mentioned a national coordination meeting.
B Regional and International coordination			
B1 Attendance of international meetings			
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Partly	Not all the DCF eligible meetings are listed. We recommend to be filled all eligible meetings. MS did not participated to some relevant meetings
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Partly	Concerning GFCM meetings, MS stated that: "*A low participation was recorded in GFCM meetings because of poor communications with the institutions involved and the overlapping of several events in the same period of time. This situation will be corrected in the future because was created the Black Sea - GFCM Working Group (BSWG / GFCM), and GFCM focal points for each Black Sea riparian country*". No mention to the non attendance to some important DCF meetings. MS must give more explanation why they do not participate.
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A General description of the fishing sector			
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		
B Economic variables			
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	length class column is missing
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Transversal variables should not be reported in this table.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls			
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	MS has to detail more
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
C Biological métier related variables			
C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR	Mostly	In Table III.C.5, data are not filled in by

		guidelines?	regional level, but in Annex 46, the agreement between Romanian NAFA and Bulgarian NAFA is presented. Also, in the Bulgarian table III.C.5 are reported a number of samples to be collected at Regional Level. MS should complete the table IIIC5 with data at regional level.
		Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly: Regarding the Midwater otter trawl, on the 48 trips planned only 10 have been achieved.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes: MS stated that in 2011 only one vessel operated in the area. Moreover, due to the fact that the fishing activity is linked to the season, the vessel was active for a very short period of time
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes
		Were CV targets met?	Yes
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA: no derogations are presented in the NP
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes: The relevant RCM Med&BS recommendations are listed plus the action taken by the MS
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
D	**Recreational fisheries**		
D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA: Achievements are not relevant due to the absence of the target species (Bluefin tuna and Eels) in the area
		Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No: No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But a derogation is present and was requested in the NP 2011-2013
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes: In Romanian marine waters the eel catch is absent. Also the bluefin tuna fishery is absent
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes
D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were data quality targets provided?	NA
		Were data quality targets met?	NA
		Are the deviations explained?	NA
		Are the deviations justified?	NA
D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No: No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But a derogation is present and was requested in the NP 2011-2013
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
D4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
E	**Biological stock-related variables**		
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly: MS should clarify if there was an agreement at Regional level with Bulgaria for the collection of samples and the calculation of CV (see Bulgarian AR 2011 and Romania NP 2011). In the Romania NP 2011 is reported a number of specimens to be collected at Regional level plus a bilateral agreement reached between the two countries (Bulgaria and Romania) for the collection of samples of the main species. In the table of the AR the column "Planned number of individuals to be measured at Regional Level" has not been fulfilled
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly: In the Romania NP 2011 is reported a number of specimens to be collected at Regional level. MS should clarify it. At National level the achieved length and age sampling has exceeded the

				required and planned levels for most of the species.
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	For the exceeding samples MS explained that: "*The excess sampling has taken place due to continuation of the previous sampling practices because the data series are used for analytical assessment purposes.*" Excess sampling has been realised on the national expense of Romanian NIMRD Constanta. Again MS should explain the situation at Regional level, why has not been achieved any samples
		Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	still missing the explanation for the Regional approach
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
		Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	still missing the explanation for the Regional approach
		Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Concerning the national issue is mostly because only for few species/parameters has been not achieved the requested CV. *Merlangius merlangus euxinus* is present in the table because part of the discarded fraction, it was not present in the planned sampling. At Regional level is NA
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should justified the high CV achieved for some species/parameters and the missing information for the Regional part
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But derogation is present and was requested in the NP 2011-2013. MS should mention it and precise if has been accepted or not
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Mostly	In many cases the responsive actions mentioned the cooperation with Bulgaria. Reading the AR report seems that the results of this cooperation have not been really achieved. MS to clarify
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	only linked to financial aspects.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	MS should solve the problems linked to the Regional approach
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Capacity data quality should not be given. Landings or effort data quality should not be given when they are issued from logbooks or sales notes. CV should be given for effort and landings variables not issued from logbooks or sales notes.
F1	**Capacity**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Capacity data quality should not be given
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Refers to internal communications and collaboration. Capacity data was collected exhaustively.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F2	**Effort**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR

			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Internal collaboration comment
	F3	**Landings**			
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
		F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Internal collaboration comment
G	**Research surveys at sea**				
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Acoustic surveys do not have any nautical mile targets that should be included to measure achievement.
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	The first part (in the second quarter) of pelagic survey (in common with Bulgaria) has not been conducted. Survey has been carried out only in the fourth quarter.
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**			
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Mostly	Insufficient temporal coverage for the Pelagic survey.
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No list provided (although addressed one recommendation in text). MS should list and address all relevant recommendations from RCM Med&BS for 2010 and 2011.
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Mostly	The problems are related to financial issues and to the collaboration with the Bulgarian part.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	Shortfalls are described, but details of actions to avoid this in future are not provided
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**				
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**				
			Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	MS has to detail other fresh water fish
			Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
			Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CV for response rates lower than 70% are missing
	A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Reference year 2011?
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	p37 of National Program
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
			Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**				
			Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	

		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some CV values missing MS has to fill all lines in the column "variables"
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	In the table MS should indicate the effective time lag for the availability of the collected information. The VMS data are not available because it is used by only one vessel which carry out few fishing trips
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	No	MS should detailed the progress achieved so far in the management of data
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	Is not clear if a national DCF website is ready. MS to clarify
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?		
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

	Member State:	Slovenia		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	Text 31/05/2001 2 Tables v05	
		Version of the NP proposal	9-Dec-2010	
			Answer	EWG COMMENTS
		Overall compliance		
I	General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes	Commission Decision 2010/93/EU not mentioned
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	No	No national coordination meeting in 2011.
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Mostly	Only meetings relating to MED and which were planned are listed. EWG-11-08 recommended to include in the AR the complete list of eligible meetings in Table II.B.1.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	Explanations needed
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No	Paragraph with all the RCM and Liaison meeting recommendations needed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Partly	Only for one recommendation.
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	
	SUPRA-REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		
B	Economic variables		Mostly	
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Names of segments should be those stated in the regulation.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	NA	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	For some segments, energy costs, variable costs, repair and maintenance costs and investments and physical capital variables are missing. Transversal variables should not be included in this table
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA			
C	Biological métier related variables			Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables
C1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete. For GTR_DEF_0_0 (Métier level 6 - mesh size and other selective devices), consistency with the agreement reached at regional level (RCM Med&BS 2009) needs to be checked. All métiers were undersampled compared to NP objectives.

Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Table complete. All fishing activities were undersampled compared to NP objectives, especially for the biggest one (netters achieved at only 31 %).
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table complete except for CVs on volume of discards. Achievement rates are OK for the two species planned for sampling in the NP. No information provided for other species, whereas Slovenia is implementing the concurrent sampling method.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Information provided only for anchovy and sardine. For these species, why were more fish reported to be sampled in Table III.C.6 (11305) than in Table III.C.5 (10002)? Is concurrent sampling really implemented? See also comment on GTR_DEF_0_0 above.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	See comments on Tables III.C.3 to III.C.6. The numbers of trips achieved is always lower than the planned ones. Targets in numbers of fish measured for the two main species are achieved, but no information on other species caught although concurrent sampling is seemingly applied by Slovenia.
Are the deviations explained?	No	Mixture in the AR text between métiers variables and transversal variables? MS should explain why in the AR text Slovenia wrote to have only two métiers to sample when in the NP and AR technical tables are listed 5 métiers? No deviation found by Slovenia. MS should clarify.
Are the deviations justified?	No	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	Only for retained catch and discards length sampling. Not for volume of discards.
Were CV targets met?	No	
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	Why CVs on volumes of discards is explained (weight of discards cannot be collected). No explanation why precision target is not achieved for SPF with more than 4000 individuals measured by species.
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should complete the paragraph with all the RCM-MED&BS and Liaison meeting recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	No	No responsive actions is described
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	No action is described
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	MS reported that no recreational activity targeting the two species (i.e. *Thunnus thynnus* and *Anguilla anguilla*), for which is mandatory collect data in the Mediterranean. That fact is not mentioned in the NP 2011-2013 in which a general survey on recreational fisheries is planned.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	No derogation has been clearly requested in the NP for eel and blue fin tuna.
Are the deviations explained?	No	No quantitative information provided on eel and blue fin tuna even through the national survey. Nothing also about sharks and eel in inland waters.
Are the deviations justified?		

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogation has been clearly requested in the NP for eel and blue fin tuna.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	But why MS planned to age so many fish when with 25-30% achievement rates gave requested precision targets for ALKs? MS should adjust its NP to more realistic objectives.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviation. CVs are achieved when less fish are sampled than planned (ALKs).
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	Except for sardine and *Engraulis encrasicolus* sex ratio@length.
Are the deviations explained?	No	No text is given to explain deviation, no details are provided on the method used to calculate CV's. MS to clarify
Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to provide clarification on methodology

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should complete the paragraph with all the RCM-MED&BS and Liaison meeting recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	No	No responsive actions is described
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS should adjust its NP to more realistic objectives for ALKs.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Names of segments should be those stated in the regulation. Achieved sample rate not appropriate for census. CV should be provided for value of landings when they are calculated from questionnaires

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F13 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

F2 Effort

F21 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F22 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F23 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

F24 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

F3 Landings

F31 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

F32	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Not clear from table/ text how questionnaires are used for value of landings. In case questionnaires are used, CV should be provided
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS to clarify the use of the questionnaire
F33	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in the AR
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
F34	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION MEDITERRANEAN & BLACK SEA

G	**Research surveys at sea**		
G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		MEDITS and MEDIAS surveys
	Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table is complete but achieved targets (column R) are wrong.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Text provides information not given in table III.G.1. Objectives are achieved for both surveys.
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	There is no deviation.
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	For the both surveys.
G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	MS should complete the paragraph with all the RCM-MED&BS (including WGMEDITS ones) and Liaison meeting recommendations
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified.
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**		
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**	Yes	
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	Species names should followed guidelines
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	NA	
	Are the deviations justified?	NA	
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		

		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Indicators 8 and 9 not completed.
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations presented in AR
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Shortfalls and actions not identified and described for all indicator.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	For those that are described
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**			
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Not consistent with guidelines. No details provided. For example, no specific expert group or project, description of species and fleet segments. Not all the expert groups or project are reported in the table.
		Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table in NP refers to data calls for France and thus not relevant. MS should explain both the missing information sent to expert groups and the missing presence of some end users (i.e. PGMed; GFCM WG) in the table.
		Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	National DB is well described.
		Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Information on website and transmission of data missing.
		Are the deviations explained?	No	Information is missing and deviations not explained
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**			
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	4 recommendations listed, relating more with SGRN and LM. Not clear whether all relevant recommendations have been listed
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**			
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**			
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	On needs to continue the DB upgrading and to keep the same data calls formats.
X	**X. References**			
		Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	
XI	**XI. Annexes**			
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	NA	No annex

	Member State:	Spain		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	30-May-2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	15-Sep-11	
			Answer	EWG 12-08 COMMENTS
		Overall compliance		
I	General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Mostly	Wrong decision and old financial regulation
II	National data collection organisation			
A	National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Yes	
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	One on 17/11 in Madrid. Subjects discussed are detailed.
B	Regional and International coordination			
B1	Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Mostly	Only for few meetings (eligible under DCF), but for all economic ones, there were no attendances from MS
B2	Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes	No 2011 recommendations
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
III	Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector			
A	General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	Some changes detailed by MS for XII, NAFO regions.
	SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlantic			
B	Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Colours are used to share areas of the table but no information is given on their meaning.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided, variables as quota leasing that do not make sense for this MS should be marked with a "NA" instead of being left blank
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Capital value calculation not explained
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided
		Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	CV either not applicable or no data available
		Are the deviations justified?	No	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations			
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls			
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Questionnaire for the collection of economic variables continues to be modified to adapt it to DCF requirements
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
	SUPRA-REGION Mediterranean Sea & Black Sea			
B	Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Colours are used to share areas of the table but no information is given on their meaning.
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided, variables as quota leasing that do not make sense for this MS should be marked with a "NA" instead of being left blank
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Capital value calculation not explained

	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	CV either not applicable or no data available
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Questionnaire for the collection of economic variables continues to be modified to adapt it to DCF requirements
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
SUPRA-REGION Other regions			
B	**Economic variables**		
	Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Colours are used to share areas of the table but no information is given on their meaning.
	Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided, variables as quota leasing that do not make sense for this MS should be marked with a "NA" instead of being left blank
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Capital value calculation not explained
	Are the deviations explained?	No	
	Are the deviations justified?	No	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	Some CVs not provided
	Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	CV either not applicable or no data available
	Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Questionnaire for the collection of economic variables continues to be modified to adapt it to DCF requirements
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic		General comments Module C	- Need to identify in the tables III.C.3 to III.C.6 a column for comments to be discussed. - In the text of the AR the name of the Region should be reported as North Atlantic (Ices areas V-XIV and NAFO areas): the name of the Region should be consistent with the one reported in the Appendix II of the EU Dec 93/2010.
C	**Biological métier related variables**		
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	In the column M should be reported the real number of the total "No. of trips during the Sampling year" and not an estimation.
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	The sampling activity carried out for one métier, the OTM_DEF_100-129_0_0, is missing: even if no trips have been carried out it should be reported (also to have consistency with table III.C.3 where two métier operating in the region are reported)
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	One of the two métier present in the area has not been sampled. Species *Sebastes mentella* has not been sampled (it was planned in the NP). Cod oversampled without extra costs.

Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Vessels targeting redfish xere operating in NA region.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	For the only species considered (*Gadus morhua*) has been achieved a good CV
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION North Atlantic (excluding Ices areas V-XIV and NAFO areas)

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	In the column M should be reported the number of trips during the Sampling year. Numbers of trips missing for most of the métiers.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	see comment above
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Most of CVs provided.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Métier GNS_DEF_40_59 did not appear in III.C.3.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Not all the métiers reached the planned number of trips (in total 1835 trips have been achieved vs 2928 planned). For the métier PS_SPF were planned 1172 trips and only 443 have been achieved. Most of species sampled in VII and VIII-IXa were highly oversampled.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS well explained by métier and by species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Partly	For the majority of the stocks have been achieved a CV around 12.5% for landings. For 2 species only for discards length structures and volumes.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But a derogation is present and was requested in the NP 2011-2013
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NA 2011 recommendation on change of métier naming OTB_DES not listed
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	But no proposal to adjust the numbers of fish to be measured.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION North Atlantic (Ices areas V-XIV and NAFO areas)

C Biological métier related variables	General comments Module C	Place of NAFO (separate or not from North Atlantic region) to be defined according to the RCM in charge of this area.

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	In the column M should be reported the real number of the total No. of trips during the Sampling year and not an estimation.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	see comment above
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Good achievement rates for métiers and species
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS well explained by métier and by species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
	Were CV targets met?	Mostly	For the majority of the stocks have been achieved a CV around 12,5% for landings and discards length structures, but only for 1 species for volumes of discards.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea			
		General comments Module C	In the text of the AR, "Mediterranean ICCAT" should be reported together with Mediterranean and Black Sea: is not another region!
C	**Biological métier related variables**		
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Numbers of trips 2011 often missing
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	see comment above
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Métier GNS_SLP did not appear in table III.C.3.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	For some métier and some species was not possible to achieve the planned number of trips and/or samples. Major deviations for concurrent at sea objectives. Half of species oversampled (very high for some of them, as swordfish).
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS well explained by métier and by species.
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	MS well described exemptions for discards.
	Were CV targets met?	Partly	As reported in the text of the AR, for different species the CV estimates resulted higher than the required ones
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But a derogation is present and was requested in the NP 2011-2013
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Other Regions (CECAF)			
		General comments Module C	Usefulness or not to introduce in tables a column for RFMOs ?
C	**Biological métier related variables**		
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	5 métiers in III.C.3, only 4 reported in III.C.6. Not homogenous coding of CECAF region.
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	The planned trips have been achieved almost entirely for all the métiers (few problems with PS and OTB). Only shrimp *F. notialis* appears undersampled.
	Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No explanations for no data providing in III.C.6 table for PS_SPF.
	Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	

Were CV targets met?	Mostly	CVs achieved for half of the species for landings, but not achieved at all for discards.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Other Regions (ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC, WCPCF)

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Numbers of trips missing for some métiers.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	see comment above
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	CVs provided only for landings length structures.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	In the Atlantic ICCAT have been achieved only 546 trips for LHP_LPF_TROP on the 4400 planned. In the IOTC have been achieved 129 trips for PS_LPF_TROP on the 180 planned. CV has not been estimated for discards.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS well explained by métier and by species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	Only for landings.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Precision targets rarely achieved for species planned in NP. But some CVs achieved for by catch species.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS well explained by species.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	no derogations are presented in the NP
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Problems of observers on board in IOTC.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	

REGION North Atlantic

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Catch estimates for eel available even whether planned pilot study for biological samplings could not be carry out due to budgetary constraints.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	RCM NA derogation for eel in marine waters not listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	NA	No derogations are presented in the NP
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	RCM Med&BS derogation for eel in marine waters not listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Cell notes should be deleted from the table, and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	The species *Sebastes mentella* has not been sampled (it was planned in the NP) and a lower number of specimens, in respect to the planned ones, of *Gadus morhua* have been collected.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should better clarify why have been achieved a low number of specimens of *G. morhua*, and why no samples of *S. mentella* have been collected.

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	Only for *G. morhua*
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	CV achieved for *G. morhua* met the required precision. *Sebastes mentella* has not been sampled.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	The achieved CV met the required precision.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations are presented in the NP.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	MS should report the actions taken in respect to the RCM recommendations (e.g. " look for inconsistencies and errors and suggest on corrections this refers to naming of stock/area, species included and errors in sampling level"). In the table of the AR, MS answer is "not applicable"...MS should clarify it.

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Partly	MS should be more precise in the way they could enhance coordination and sampling activity in the area.

REGION North Atlantic

		MS should consider the fishing grounds under one Region all together and not in separate sections of the text (i.e. NAFO e ICES XII, XIV)

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	MS should strictly follow the guidelines, otherwise is very difficult to compare the text with the tables. In the text of the AR the NAFO and ICES XII, XIV should be reported under the North Atlantic Region (Ices areas V-XIV and NAFO areas - Appendix II EU Dec 93/2010): NAFO and ICES XII, XIV is not a Region!! Cell notes should be deleted from the table, and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	For few species and in some fishing grounds, the number of achieved

		specimens have been lower than the planned ones
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	However, for *N. norvegicus* MS may be able to meet the required samples for all the parameters. MS to justify the sampling levels and provide details of the financial implications.
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	For some species/parameters the CVs resulted higher than the requested one. However, MS should better explain over sampling on such a huge scale is not fully explained and the impact on the costs of sampling is also not highlighted.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some species/stock
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Partly	MS should be more precise and concrete in the way they could enhance coordination and sampling activity in the area
E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Mediterranean and Black Sea		
E Biological stock-related variables		MS should consider the fishing grounds under one Region all together and not in separate sections of the text (i.e. ICCAT Mediterranean)
E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Cell notes should be deleted from the table, and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR. Under the column "Achieved precision target (CV)" should be deleted the string "triennial"!! For large pelagic species under the column "Planned minimum No of individuals to be measured at the regional level" should be reported also the planned number agreed at Regional level (see RCM Med&BS report 2010). In the text of the AR "Mediterranean ICCAT" should be reported together with Mediterranean and Black Sea.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Only for few species has been not possible to achieve the planned number of specimens. MS should revise the percentage achievements for large pelagic species.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should be more precise in the way they justify the deviations, is not very clear and in some case is not acceptable the justifications given . For example the reported justification for *Mullus barbatus* is " El número de otolitos recogido es inferior al planificado porque se recoge un número determinado de otolitos por clase de talla al mes." Is it not possible to increase the number of planned specimens? What are the intentions of MS to avoid these deviations? MS to clarify.
E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	There have been problems with the ageing of some species (e.g. *M. barbatus* and *M. surmuletus*).
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	No	For *M. barbatus* a sentence like "Se han recogido los otolitos pero no se han leido por problemas de salud del lector" is not a justification. For *E.*

		encrasicolus "No se consigue el nivel de precisión requerido por la gran variabilidad de tallas en cada clase de edad" MS should increase the sampling intensity for each age class and size category, expecially for those species having a relative short life cycle.
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some species/stock. MS should report all these recommendations.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
REGION Other Regions (CECAF, ICCAT, IOTC, IATTC, WCPCF)		
E	**Biological stock-related variables**	MS should consider the fishing grounds under one Region all together and not in separate sections of the text.
E1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	In the table, CECAF or IOTC etc should be reported as "Other Regions" (Appendix II EU Dec 93/2010) and then the different RFMO (i.e. CECAF, IOTC, WCPCF etc.) and fishing ground should be specified. MS should strictly follow the guidelines. Note cells should be deleted from the table and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR. Under the column "Achieved precision target (CV)" should be deleted the string "triennial", it is reported in the table III.E.2.
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
Were CV estimates provided?	No	Following the Appendix VII of the EU Dec 93/2010 the periodicity for the calculation of the CV is every three years
Were CV targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	No derogations are mentioned in MS 2011 AR. But some derogations were requested in the NP 2011-2013 on non-sampling some species/stock
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Mostly	For large pelagic species, MS should be more precise in the way they could perform and improve the sampling activity in the area
F	**Transversal variables**	
Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table III.F.1 is completely empty; even if a description on the national situation is reported in the text of the AR. MS should resubmit the table with the requested information.
F1	**Capacity**	
F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Since no data are reported the group assumed that there are deviations from NP.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
Is respective data quality information given?	No	Full coverage is mentioned but no coverage indicator is provided.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	

			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS should firstly resubmit the table.
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	MS mentioned an improving of the database.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS should firstly resubmit the table.
F2	**Effort**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	No	Since no data are reported the group assumes that there are deviations from NP proposal.
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	No	Quality assurance measures are described, but quality indicators are not provided.
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	MS should firstly resubmit the table.
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines.
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS mentioned an improving of the database.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS should firstly resubmit the table.
F3	**Landings**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Since no data are reported the group assumes that there are deviations from NP proposal.
			Are the deviations explained?	NA	
			Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	No	
			Are the deviations explained?	Partly	DB do not allow for data crossing yet, questionnaire results not available yet.
			Are the deviations justified?	No	MS should be able to collect the requested information.
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines.
			Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	MS mentioned an improving of the database.
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	MS should firstly resubmit the table.
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Name of the surveys should be consistent with the name reported in the Appendix IX of the EU Dec 93/2010. MS should adjust the table. Acoustic surveys should have nautical mile targets rather than number of transects as a measure of achievement. Hydrological stations planned and achieved should not be presented in this table as this is not eligible for DCF funding.
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Few deviations have been recorded in the DEPM surveys, in the Flemish Cap Groundfish survey and Medits: not all the type of planned sampling activities or days at sea have been carried out. For the Medias survey was not possible to cover all the planned area.
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes	National report in Spanish, so had difficulties assessing this properly
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	Maps should be included in the main body of annual report and not in annex
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	Flemish Cap groundfish and Medias survey had low achievement and could effect quality of indices, but this was related too poor weather and

		unavoidable technical problems
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Partly	This was done for the NAFO and RCM Med&BS areas, but not for other areas. Recommendations not listed for all areas or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations.
Are the responsive actions described?	Mostly	For the areas where listed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	National report in Spanish, so had difficulties assessing this properly

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	National report in Spanish, so had difficulties assessing this properly

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	MS should complete table with No when there is no activity in the segment.
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table used it's not the most recent version in the guidelines (DCF_Guidelines_AR_Version_2012) . MS should use the latest version.

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Text is in Spanish
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	CV's are missing in the table IV.A.3. MS should update the table to the most recent version.
Are the deviations explained?	No	
Are the deviations justified?	No	CV's should be provided in the annual report

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table used it's not the most recent version in the guidelines (DCF_Guidelines_AR_ Version_2012). MS should use the latest version.

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS should try to get the number of enterprises accordingly to the number of employees defined in the DCF regulation. Table IV.B.2 must be updated to the latest version
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Accuracy indicators are not mandatory for data from SBS.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS should describe how they can calculate the number of enterprises per number of employees accordingly to the DCF regulation.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	No	

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Time interval for the position reports is completely missing from the table
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations are presented in the NP/AR

2 Actions to avoid

shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls identified.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	NA	Table in NP refers to data calls for France and thus not relevant.
Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Mostly	National report in Spanish, so had difficulties assessing this properly.
Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II)?	NA	MS should provide this information
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	No targets set in NP for data transmission, which makes it difficult to evaluate against achievement in AR. There is no information related to the web site, upload of data to international databases or management of data.
Are the deviations explained?	No	Information is missing and deviations not explained.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	No deviations according to MS.

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	No	MS did not identify any shortfalls, but this needs to be addressed.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	National report in Spanish, so had difficulties assessing this properly.

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	

IX Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	

X References

Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	

XI Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

		Member State:	**Sweden**	
			Reference year	2011
			Version of the AR reviewed	5/28/2012
			Version of the NP proposal	25-Feb-2011
				Answer / **EWG 12-08 COMMENTS**
			Overall compliance	
I	**General framework**		Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Yes
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**		
			Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Mostly / re-organisation of national partners, (new) roles need to be explained
			Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes / New improved internal structure between institutes, videoconferencing, very brief listing of contents of physical meetings
	B	**Regional and International coordination**		
		B1 **Attendance of international meetings**		
			Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes
			Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	Yes / Did attend all planned EG except WGNEW and WGDEEP (postponed and irrelevant, respectively)
		B2 **Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	Yes / RCM recommendations older than 2008 not relevant
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes / Several are not updated
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes / Several old recommendations are answered as future intentions and stay unverified
	SUPRA-REGION Baltic Sea, North Sea and Eastern Arctic, and North Atlanti			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A	**General description of the fishing sector**		
			Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes
	B	**Economic variables**		
			Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly / Response rate should be given in case of census. CV should be provided for all variables. Transversal variables should not be presented in this table. Some economic variables are missing (Income from leasing out quota or other fishing rights, Investments in physical capital, Lease/rental payments for quota or other fishing right)
		B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes / (Explanation of clustering should be in this section and not under data quality)
			Are the deviations explained?	Yes / (The absence of Income from leasing out quota or other fishing rights is explained)
			Are the deviations justified?	Yes
		B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
			Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly / Some CV's are missing, no explanation why
			Are the deviations explained?	Partly
			Are the deviations justified?	Partly
		B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes / No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
			Are the responsive actions described?	Yes
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes
		B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes
	REGION Baltic			
	C	**Biological métier related variables**		
		C1 **Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes
			Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes / Column M (Total no. of trips…) is lacking values for some sampling frames
			Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes / CVs given in percentages, but probably should be numbers, as values seem to be extremely low

		considering the usually high variation observed. Giving exact (non-rounded) numbers of individuals planned to be measured seems not appropriate in terms of planning uncertainties, e.g. single fish planned to be sampled.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Sampling effort not adjusted to actual effort in 2011. Variation in most cases within acceptable range although GNS_DEF_110-156_0_0 is severely oversampled (300%). 46% is over- or under sampled by more than 25% compared to actual effort in 2011. Around half of the species in Table III.C.5 are undersampled.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	Undersampling of species not explained

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Due to sampling stratification design, COST was only used to estimate CVs for *volumes* of discards (Table III.C.5). Own CV calculation used elsewhere. CVs given in percentages, but probably should be numbers, as values seem to be extremely low considering the usually high variation observed.
Were CV targets met?	Yes	OK where CV was calculated.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviations were detected
Are the deviations justified?	NA	cannot be fully assessed (see comments on Table III.C.5)

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Derogations listed in Table III.C.3
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	Everything relevant is fulfilled

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	New sampling scheme is developed

REGION NS&EA

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	CVs given in percentages, but probably should be numbers, as values seem to be extremely low considering the usually high variation observed. Giving exact (non-rounded) numbers of individuals planned to be measured seems not appropriate in terms of planning uncertainties.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Sampling effort not adjusted to actual effort in 2011. OTB_CRU_90-119_0_0 IIIaS is oversampled due to reduced fishing effort, other OTB métiers severely undersampled. 67% is over- or undersampled with more than 25% compared to actual effort in 2011. Most of the species in Table III.C.5 are undersampled.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Due to sampling stratification design, COST was only used to estimate CVs for *volumes* of discards (Table III.C.5). Own CV calculation used elsewhere. CVs given in percentages, but probably should be numbers, as values seem to be extremely low considering the usually high variation observed.
Were CV targets met?	Yes	OK where CV is calculated.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviation were detected
Are the deviations justified?	NA	cannot be fully assessed (see comments on Table III.C.5)

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Derogations listed in Table III.C.3
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION Baltic

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	No derogations
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviation
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviations
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	No data submitted to WGBFAS due to missing format.

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No shortfalls for cod- only minor for salmon
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Increased sampling and improved sampling design suggested.

REGION NS&EA

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	Yes	No derogations
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviation reported, unclear if results on sharks (cf. NP proposal) are available
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	NA	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No deviations
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	No shortfalls and no actions
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION Baltic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Only 2010 data for Eels listed. These data should not have been included in the 2011 report
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Partly	Rather significant under sampling
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	Only 2010 data for Eels listed. These data should not have been included in the 2011 report
Were CV targets met?	Mostly	all except at Weight at age
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	see general comment

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogations
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION North Sea and Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	significant under sampling of some major species
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Mostly	
Were CV targets met?	Partly	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	MS should have developed non age based calculations. See general comments

	E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	derogations listed in NP but not mentioned in AR
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
	E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F	**Transversal variables**			
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	Capacity data quality should not be given. CV should be provided for effort data not based on logbooks. nor effort or landings data quality when they are issued from logbooks or sales notes
	F1	**Capacity**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F2	**Effort**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	No qualitative description of resulting data quality values is given, (CV are also not available for effort data not based on logbooks)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
	F3	**Landings**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	(Landings were not present in NP)
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	No deviations
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No relevant recommendations
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	BITS 1q target achievements only 78%, No herring larval hauls carried out.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
		Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	N/A	
		Are the deviations justified?	N/A	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	No	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations. Commission

		Decision (2010/93/EU) needs to be addressed
Are the responsive actions described?	N/A	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	R/V Dana will be chartered again next year
IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry		
A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture		
Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	All species from template should be specified
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Response rate should be filled in case of census. For non probability sampling response rate, CV of the estimator and CV of the observed values should be filled in table, according to the guidelines
A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	For non-probability sampling no quality information is given. Other shellfish is missing.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	No explanation for not reporting quality indicators in case of scheme c.
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	
A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
B Collection of data concerning the processing industry		
Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	It is unclear whether some variables are indeed result of an estimation. MS to be clarified.
B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	It is unclear whether some variables are indeed result of an estimation. MS to be clarified.
Are the deviations explained?	Mostly	MS should list the variables that are the result of an estimation and not collected under SBS
Are the deviations justified?	Mostly	MS should list the variables that are the result of an estimation and not collected under SBS
B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem		
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Were the relevant derogations listed?	N/A	
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	N/A	No shortfalls given.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	
VI Module for management and use of the data		
1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	
Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II)?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Reorganization of the institute
2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations		

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	

IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	No	

X. References

Is there a complete list of references?	Yes	

XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		thorough going through CV calculations

	Member State:	**United Kingdom**		
		Reference year	2011	
		Version of the AR reviewed	Text 31 May 2012, Tables 12 Jun 2012	
		Version of the NP proposal	Dec 2010	
		Overall compliance	**Answer**	**EWG COMMENTS**
I	**General framework**	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?	Mostly	MS mentioned activities carried out to meet DCR regulation, which is nit applicable since 2009.
II	**National data collection organisation**			
	A National correspondent and participating institutes			
		Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	Partly	NC's institute + 4 partners. Aquaculture, economic and processing industry data collectors not mentioned.
		Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?	Yes	One national coordination meeting held in 2011. Minutes provided in annex.
	B Regional and International coordination			
	B1 Attendance of international meetings			
		Is Table II.B.1 complete?	Yes	The table provided is not the last version produced by EU (without consequence for UK). MS states "All planned meetings were attended by UK representatives", but there's no attendance to economic meetings.
		Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?	No	Non attendance at all the economic meetings not explained by MS.
	B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations			
		Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?	No	MS should list in this section all the relevant recommendations from all RCMs which are not dealt with a specific section of the report (see guidelines)
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	SUPRA-REGION ATLANTIC			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**			
	A General description of the fishing sector			
		Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?	Yes	Important changes with great impact on NP implementation. UK fishing fleet is decreasing for the last decade. But only changes between references used for writing NP 2011-2013 and year 2011 could explain difficulties to implement the NP in 2011. Bilateral agreements for sampling are mentioned by MS.
	B Economic variables			
		Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
		Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	DCF names of variables not used
		Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Fleet segments not well specified (reference to sample rate in table III B 1 is confusing). Table is not the latest version. MS should use the latest version of the template
	B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Lower than planned sampling rates for hooks. Information of clustering not provided, as requested in guidelines
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	e.g. due to low activity in hooks
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal			
		Is respective data quality information given?	Partly	Template used is not the latest version. MS should use the latest version of the templates. CV as "Other variability indicator" not provided for non probability sampling, as requested in guidelines
		Are the deviations explained?	No	
		Are the deviations justified?	No	

B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
	Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Attempts to increase coverage of segments with large number of vessels
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

C Biological métier related variables

Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table not sorted by year and distinction of 3 sub-MS (UKS, UKN and UKE) with reason explained in the text. Only sorting by region and fishing ground should appear in table III.C3. Only AR year data are to be provided. MS should explain the meaning of the red lines because all concerned métiers are not planned in NP. At the métier scale, when no considering sampling strategies separately (distribution of trips from concurrent sampling at the market to at sea or stock specific sampling being noticeable).
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table not sorted by year and distinction of 3 sub-MS (UK-S, UK-N and UK-E). Only AR year data are to be provided.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table complete and consistent with AR guidelines. Many species not planned in the NP 2011-2013 added by MS in the table (species in red, especially Selacians, Crustaceans, flatfish, G3 species). When no CVs are provided for these extra species, reporting in Table III.C.6, where retained and discarded fish are also provided separately, should be sufficient.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Métiers inconsistent with Table III.C.3 (e.g.: GND_DEF_0_0_0 from Table III.C.6 doesn't appear in Table III.C3). Some strange métiers (OTM_MAC and OTM_HER).
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	MS clearly identified and detailed deviations in its AR. Changes in the sampling schemes by implementing recommendations of DCF methodological workshops produced some difficulties to evaluate achievement rates by métiers (métiers not planned in the NP, changes of sampling strategy, intensities in numbers of trips strongly modified). Objectives planned for sampling of lengths in landings are most of time achieved. According to Table III.C.3, targets planned appear achieved for towed gears, but less for passive gears. Table III.C.4: England sampling frames intensities are not achieved, except for Crustacean potting. Scotland intensities are achieved, except for SPF S3. Targets planned in numbers of fish are generally achieved and some species are even oversampled. Deficiencies (undersampling) for *Nephrops* in two functional units, cod IV/VIId, plaice VIId and for two species of rays.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Staff and budget shortages.

		Difficulties with implementing concurrent sampling due to market practices and new random sampling scheme at sea. MS provided also explanations on deviations concerning some métiers such as OTM_SPF (modification of the sampling programmme at sea due to effect of the high-grading ban regulation). 4 derogations granted by EU on specific species for métiers variables are provided in the AR text.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CV's reported for the majority of species planned in the NP as well for retained catch, discards as volume of discards. CVs also provided for some extra species sampled intensely.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Target precision met for 6 stocks for market sampling. However no CVs are reported for some species with very high sample numbers - no explanation is provided in these cases: sole and plaice in VIId for example. 6 species*areas for which CVs on volumes of discards are achieved or nearly met (*Trigla lucerna*, lemon sole, cod, whiting,...).
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks. To increase sampling intensity at sea is not unrealistic taking in account the excessive costs required.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Derogations granted to MS for 4 species listed in AR text.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NS&EA, LM, PGCCDBS recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	Better international coordination of sampling designs in the NS area. Hope for recruitment of new staff.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

C Biological métier related variables

Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table not sorted by year and distinction of 3 sub-MS (UK-S, UK-N and UK-E) with reason explained in the text. Only sorting by region and fishing ground should appear in Table III.C.3. Only AR year data are to be provided. Meaning of the red lines unclear, as all concerned métiers are not planned in NP.
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table not sorted by year and distinction of 3 sub-MS (UK-S, UK-N and UK-E). Only AR year data are to be provided.
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Table complete and consistent with AR guidelines. Many species not planned in the NP 2011-2013 added by MS in the table (species in red, especially Selacians, Crustaceans, flatfish, G3 species). When no CVs are provided for these extra species, reporting in Table III.C.6, where retained and discarded fish are also provided separately, should be sufficient.
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Mostly	Some métiers are provided at level 5. Métiers inconsistent with

		Table III.C.3 (e.g. OTB_CRU_0_0_0 from Table III.C.6 doesn't appear in Table III.C3). Some strange métiers (0_0_0_0, LX_DEF_0_0_0, etc).
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	According to Table III.C.3, at the métier scale, when no considering sampling strategies separately (distribution of trips from concurrent sampling at the market to at sea or stock specific sampling being noticeable), targets planned appear achieved only for Sub-area VI. Most of the métiers are undersampled in other fishing grounds (especially in VIIa, Celtic sea and VIIe). Pelagic trawling (OTM_SPF) is everywhere strongly undersampled. Regarding Table III.C.4, England sampling frames intensities are not achieved, except for the sampling programme at sea. Scotland ones are achieved. Objectives planned for sampling of lengths in landings are most of time achieved, at the stock level (without breakdown between fishing grounds). Some stocks undersampled in VIIa and Vb. Targets planned in numbers of fish are generally achieved (at the stocks level, i.e. by adding fishing grounds) and some species are even oversampled.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	MS clearly identified and detailed deviations in its AR. Staff and budget shortages. Difficulties with implementing concurrent sampling due to market practices and new random sampling scheme at sea, TACs decreasing, restrained access to fish at some markets are also reasons given. MS provided also explanations on deviations concerning some métiers such as FPO_CRU and DRB_MOL (with limited resources, priority was given to sampling of fisheries targeting stocks subject to ICES analytical age-based assessments) and OTM_SPF (modification of the sampling programme at sea due to effect of the high-grading ban regulation). 11 derogations granted by EU on specific species for métiers variables are provided in the AR text. Changes in fleet behaviour concerning landing ports or no fishing in Vb (because the dispute with Faeroes on the mackerel quota), or fishing bans (*Squalus acanthias*) are also reasons provided by MS to explain undersampling of certain stocks.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	CVs reported for the majority of species planned in the NP as well for retained catch, discards as volumes of discards. CVs also provided for some extra species sampled intensity.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Target precision met for 5 stocks for market sampling (of 78 calculated). However, no CVs are reported for some species with very high sample numbers - no explanation is provided in these cases: for examples sole, monkfish, red gurnard and pout in VIIe and Celtic Sea, *Nephrops* FU 15, scallop and mackerel VI. 10 species*areas (of 95 provided) for which CVs on volumes of discards are achieved or nearly met.

Are the deviations explained?	Partly	MS considers that the DCF precision targets are currently unachievable for many stocks. To increase sampling intensity at sea, is not unrealistic taking in account the excessive costs required.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

C3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	Yes	Derogations granted to MS for 11 species listed in AR text.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM NA 2010 recommendations are listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	DCF regulation mentions cod, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NS&EA region. States of way appear really different in England and Scotland. While a general survey was planned to begin in 2011 in the first sub-MS, collection of data on salmon is routinely performed in Scotland. In 2011, no surveys (by telephone or on-sites) of recreational fisheries took place in 2011 in England. In Scotland, it is not clear if actions were carried out on the DCF required species cod, eel and sharks. MS should clarify.
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	No derogation mentioned.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Longer than expected pre-survey planning in England. No reason provided by MS for cod, eel and sharks in Scotland.
Are the deviations justified?	No	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	not provided.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	not provided.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	not provided.

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	RCM NS&EA recommendation on eel derogation in marine waters not listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendation listed
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	No recommendation listed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	No recommendation listed

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Survey work in England has commenced in 2012. Nothing mentioned for Scotland.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Only for England.

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	DCF regulation mentions salmon, sea bass, eel and sharks as the recreative targeted species to be sampled in the NA region. Progress appears really different in England and Scotland. Whilst a general survey was planned to begin in 2011 in the first sub-MS, collection of data on salmon is routinely performed in Scotland. Finally, in 2011, no surveys (by telephone or on-sites) of recreational fisheries took place in 2011 in England. In Scotland, it is not clear if actions were carried out on other DCF required species (sea bass, eel and sharks). No information provided also on actions in Wales and Northern Ireland.

Are obtained derogations mentioned?	No	No derogation mentioned.
Are the deviations explained?	Partly	Longer than expected pre-survey planning in England. No reason provided by MS for sea bass, eel and sharks in Scotland and for Wales and Northern Ireland. There is no mention of eel in this chapter. Later a reference is made to an annex on eel and salmon fishing sampling under section IX "Comments, Suggestion and Reflections". It is difficult to understand if this Annex is dealing with commercial or recreational fisheries, DCF or national action or management plans, or pure scientific issues.
Are the deviations justified?	No	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	No	
Were data quality targets met?	NA	not provided.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	not provided.
Are the deviations justified?	NA	not provided.

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	No	RCM NA recommendation on eel derogation in marine waters not listed.
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	Recommendations of RCM NA 2010 and 2011 listed.
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Partly	Survey work in England has commenced in 2012. Nothing mentioned for Scotland.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	Only for England.

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

E Biological stock-related variables

Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	More species provided than planned in the NP
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Numbers of fish planned generally achieved in length, less in age. Oversampled species did not induce additional expenses.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Data collected mainly during surveys, so depending on the catches of the species. No purchase of fish.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	When numbers of fish are sufficient to calculate them.
Were CV targets met?	Partly	Most of CVs did not achieve the precision targets (45 on 157 relationships calculated).
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Not sufficient fish sampled via data sources chosen by MS. To increase sampling will be at excessive costs.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	see general comment

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM-NS&EA, LM, PGCCDBS recommendations are listed. .
Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	To strengthen international coordination should allow achieving CVs at regional level. Agreement on sole VIId for ALKs mentioned by MS as an example to follow.
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

E Biological stock-related variables

Only information on 2011 are to be reported in AR technical tables (EWG-11-08)

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	More species provided than planned in the NP
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Numbers of fish planned

			generally achieved in length, less in age. Oversampled species did not induce additional expenses.
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Data collected mainly during surveys, so depending on the catches of the species. No purchase of fish.
		Are the deviations justified?		
E2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Were CV estimates provided?	Yes	When numbers of fish are sufficient to calculate them.
		Were CV targets met?	Partly	Most of CVs did not achieved the precision targets (41 on 243 relationships calculated). Why so high CVs for sex-ratio@length for *Nephrops*?
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Not sufficient fish sampled via data sources chosen by MS. To increase sampling will be at excessive costs.
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	see general comment
E3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
		Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	No derogation was expected by MS
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	Yes	RCM-NA 2010 and 2011 recommendations are listed. .
		Are the responsive actions described?	Yes	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	Yes	
E4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	To strengthen international coordination should allow to achieved CVs at regional level.
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F	**Transversal variables**		
		Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	Table III.F.1 is not provided, only a copy of the table provided with the guidelines. MS should submit completed table IIIF1
F1	**Capacity**		
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Table cannot be compared (Text states achievements are consistent with NP) but is explained in the AR
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	
F2	**Effort**		
	F21	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Table cannot be compared (Text states achievements are consistent with NP) but is explained in the AR
		Are the deviations explained?	NA	
		Are the deviations justified?	NA	
	F22	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Table cannot be compared (Text gives complete quality information)
		Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
		Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
	F23	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
		Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
	F24	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	
F3	**Landings**		
	F31	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Table cannot be compared (Text states achievements are consistent with NP) but is explained in the AR

Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
F32 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	Table cannot be compared (Text gives complete quality information)
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
F33 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations on transversal variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
F34 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

REGION NORTH SEA & EASTERN ARCTIC

G Research surveys at sea — IBTS-Q1, IBTS-Q3, NS-VIId-BTS

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	No deviations
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

G Research surveys at sea — NS Herring Acoustic Survey

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	New survey design, proposed by MS in accordance with Ireland and approved by STECF, was fully achieved.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	No impact of the new design on the results expected of the NSHAS.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	
G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	
G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

G Research surveys at sea — *Nephrops* UWTV Surveys FU6 - FU7 - FU8-9

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Mostly	Numbers of TV stations achieved but not the one in hauls during FU8-9 survey.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	Sledge lost after sampling FU8. Return to port to find another one. After that lost of time at sea, priority was given to TV stations used for stock assessments.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	
G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Mostly	Numbers of TV stations achieved for each survey, in spite of problems met in FU9 prospection.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	

Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

REGION NORTH ATLANTIC

G Research surveys at sea

W-IBTS-Q1, W-IBTS-Q4, VIIa-BC-VIIe-BTS

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	yes	W-IBTS-Q4 - numbers of hauls not achieved and for Scottish part less number of days at sea as planned.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	W-IBTS-Q4 - bad weather and gear damages.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	W-IBTS-Q4 (Scottish part) - Change of the bottom trawl allowing a better coverage of the sampling on hard grounds.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Changes neither accepted nor rejected by WGIBTS and STECF.

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

G Research surveys at sea

NA Herring Acoustic Survey

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	New survey design, proposed by MS in accordance with Ireland and approved by STECF, was fully achieved. Scottish part was performed by a commercial vessel provided at national expense by the Industry.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	New survey design
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	No impact of the new design on the results expected of the whole Herring acoustic survey.
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	NA	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	NA	

G Research surveys at sea

Nephrops UWTV Surveys FU11-13 and FU14-15

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	Numbers of TV stations achieved but not the one of hauls during FU11-13 survey.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	No impact of the lower number of hauls in FU11-13 survey. All the samples expected have been collected.
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	Yes	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	N/A	
Are the deviations justified?	N/A	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	N/A	No recommendations listed or a statement if it is a case of no relevant recommendations
Are the responsive actions described?	N/A	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	N/A	

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	No shortfalls
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Template used is not the latest version of the guidelines. MS should use the latest version.

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Yes	CV shall be in numbers, not levels.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	Method to estimate CV does not seem to be appropriate; it should be calculated and not by thumb rule be estimated.

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	
Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Partly	Table used is not the most recent version. MS should use the most recent version of the template. CV to be reported in numbers, not in levels. Coverage rate maybe in terms of Employment or turnover to have information in order to assess quality/magnitude of sector coverage.

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Yes	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	Mostly	CV shall be in numbers, not levels.
Are the deviations explained?	Yes	
Are the deviations justified?	Partly	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	NA	None
Are the responsive actions described?	NA	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	NA	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	Yes	CV for non Census data
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	Yes	

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	Yes	All indicators are described.
Were the relevant derogations listed?	NA	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	No	The table VI.1 is stated in the headings to be a copy of last year's report which need to be updated.
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Is progress in "Management data" section well detailed?	Yes	National DB is well described.
Are information on national DCF website provided (if not in section II) ?	NA	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	Yes	
Are the deviations explained?	NA	
Are the deviations justified?	N/A	

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	NA	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	N/A	

VII Follow-up of STECF recommendations

Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	Mostly	Some SGECA and SGRN 2009 to 2011 recommendations are listed and responses of MS provided.
Are the responsive actions described?	Partly	actions not clearly described, more explanation needed
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	No	

VIII List of acronyms and abbreviations

Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	Yes	

IX IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections

Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	Yes	Relating to the inclusion of an annex on eel and salmon sampling never provided in chapter III.D. MS should clarify if actions on eel are carried out or not.

X X. References

Is there a complete list of references?	No	None provided.

XI XI. Annexes

Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	Yes	Outcomes of national coordination meeting. Annex on eel and salmon in inland waters. Information on 6 bilateral agreements for collection of métiers and stocks variables.

7 DATA DEFICIENCIES, DATA TRANSMISSION, DATA CALLS

The EU Commission asked EWG 12-08 to assess the reports on data deficiencies, failures in data transmission and imperfect respond to Data Calls. In particular the Commission invited experts to examine the feedback which they receive from end users (the JRC and ICES) and to discuss whether there would be a role for expert working groups in future to evaluate and comment on this feedback. For this pilot exercise countries were allocated to Sub-groups again. The results are transferred to the EU Commission. The group spent some time familiarising themselves with the end user feedback and then discussed possible ways forward to deal with this in plenary. Some participants felt that it would be difficult in practice for experts to comment on such feedback, and that the most appropriate bodies would be either the Member States themselves and/or the chairs of Assessment Working Groups in the case of ICES feedback. Other participants felt that the expert working group could provide key input to this process and that obtaining expert opinion on this issue may be even more important than getting experts to comment at length on the Annual Reports of Member States.

The group agreed that if this kind of review is needed again, it should be done on a regional level.

Then, further consistent quality checks and valid information on data transmission failures have to be provided in advance. In particular, the meanings of comments from data end users have to be very clear. Currently a “no” could mean no data transmission, or data transmitted but not used for several reasons. As this has different legal consequences, the response to data calls and data transmission requests from end users must have a consistent and approved quality.

Regarding Terms of reference 2- reviewing information from end users on data transmission in 2011, the Commission stated that it will consider an appropriate way forward to deal with this exercise in 2013.

8 NEW EU MULTI ANNUAL PROGRAMME 2014-2020 AND COMMENTS MADE BY STECF AT THE SPRING PLENARY (APRIL 2012)

EWG 12-08 was informed by the EU-Commission that a new paper has been send to National Correspondents (NC) to be dealt with at the forthcoming meeting of NC. The Commission stated no further actions are needed by EWG 12-08 at this meeting.

EWG 12-08 considered that comments made by STECF on the EWG 12-01 meeting report do not require further work at EWG 12-08.

9 REVIEW THE GUIDELINES FOR THE 2013 REVISION OF THE NP 2011-2013

Considering that this year will be the last Revision of NP under the old DCF and assuming that only some Member States will submit amended NP with no principally new content, EWG 12-08 developed the following guidelines for the 2013 NP revision.

.

Guidelines for the amendment of National Programmes 2011-13 for the year 2013

July 2012

Background

The DCF National Programmes (NP) 2011-13 were submitted by Member States in 2010 (deadline 31 March 2010).

Member States who wished to amend their NP2011-13 for 2012 and/or 2013 had until 31 October 2011 to submit their proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 to the Commission. The proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 were evaluated by STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) 11-19 which met from 28 November to 1 December 2011. This EWG identified a number of problems with the evaluation process and made recommendations to improve it for future amendments to the NPs. The EWG's comments and recommendations were reviewed by the 39th Meeting of the STECF Plenary (Plen-12-01) that met from 16-20 April 2012.

By 31 October 2012, Member States who wished to amend their NP2011-13 for 2013 must submit their proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 to the Commission. The following guidelines are designed to help member States determine whether or not they should submit amendments to their NP2011-13 for the year 2013, and if so, how to do so to facilitate the EWG's subsequent evaluation of the proposed amendments. The present guidelines for the amendment of NPs were reviewed by STECF EWG12-08 in June 2012. They complement the *Guidelines for the submission of National Programmes 2011-2013* that were published in 2009.

1. What amendments require resubmission of the National Programme?

1.1. Amendments that require submission of the amended NP to the Commission

Member States wishing to make the following type of amendment to their National Programme for the year 2013 **should submit their proposed amended National Programme** to the Commission:

- Addition/removal of surveys or pilot studies.

- Modification of surveys or pilot studies that have an effect on the temporal aspects (continuity of survey series), spatial aspects (coverage), technical aspects (change in gear, technology) or financial aspects of the National Programme.

- A modification in sampling design or any other change in methodology e.g. a change from probability to non-probability sampling.

- A request for a derogation.

- A decrease of sampling sizes

In their amended National Programme, Member States should provide a justification for each proposed amendment and a description of the impact this will have on the data quality and coverage.

1.2. Amendments that do not require submission of the amended NP to the Commission

Member States making the following type of amendment to their National Programme **do not need to submit their proposed amended National Programme** to the Commission:

- Modification of surveys or pilot studies that do not have an effect on the temporal aspects (continuity of survey series), spatial aspects (coverage), technical aspects (change in gear, technology) or financial aspects of the National Programme.

- Updated description of the fishing or aquaculture or processing sector (e.g. number of enterprises in the population) or of the institutional set up for the DCF (e.g. changes in the role or task sharing between institutes).

- Updated or more detailed description of a methodology used (as long as these do not involve a change in methodology).

- Updated list of recommendations by STECF/RCMs etc. or follow-up actions such as changes to métier naming conventions that were agreed in an RCM.

-Updated list of eligible meetings.

- Addition or deletion of a bilateral or multilateral agreement.

- An increase of sampling sizes

- Regarding **Reference Years**, MS can choose whether or not to update the **reference years** in the text and tables of the amended NP. If a Member State updates the reference years, they do not need to resubmit their amended National Programme to the Commission, but should report on this in their Annual Report.

Note that the list under section 1.1. above is not a comprehensive list but aims to provide an indication of the type of changes considered to be important enough to require submission of the amended

National programme to the Commission. **Member States are invited to contact the Commission in case of doubt regarding whether to resubmit their amended National Programme**.

2. How should the amended National Programme be presented?

- Member States should resubmit the full programme (word file and excel file with ALL tables) and **highlight the modifications** in track changes in the word file and in a different colour in the tables. Moreover, Member States should ensure that their Tables only contain the coloured text that indicates proposed amendments (i.e. Tables should not contain any other national colour-coding, highlighted text or coloured cells). Also, Member States should refrain from adding national comments alongside the standard tables.

-On the front page of the amended National Programme (word file) please indicate, in track changes, the **date** at which the amended document was prepared.

e.g. Belgian National Programme 2011-2013

Revision for year 2013

15 October 2012

- After the front page of the NP (word file), Member States should include a section (of 1-2 pages**) summarising the proposed amendments** to the programme.

- Member States should not delete **information relating to previous years** as the amended National programme should still reflect the work that was planned for the whole period 2011-2013 (i.e. NPs should not provide information solely on the year 2013). E.g. Member States should not delete RCM/STECF or other recommendations from previous years that the Member State has already acted upon.

- If proposed amendments are based on **bilateral or multilateral agreements**, Member States should include the agreement as an annex.

- If **derogation** is requested, member States should note this clearly and include a justification for the request and information on the likely impact this would have on data availability and quality.

- For any amendment, Member States should **provide a justification** and in addition, if proposed amendments (including requests for derogations) were discussed at an RCM, member States should include **relevant information from that RCM,** e.g. what is the importance of the métier in the regional view? Has the RCM concluded that sampling is well covered by other countries? This kind of

information is usually compiled in the RCM reports, and should be included in the NP proposal allowing the EWG to judge the potential consequences of a derogation or an amendment.

- If a **change in methodology** is proposed, Member States should provide details about the proposed changes or the proposed new methodology to be followed.

- Member States are reminded to **follow the *Guidelines*** *for the submission of National Programmes 2011-2013 e.g.* Member States should use scientific species names throughout the Programme.

3. Which changes will require adoption by the Commission of the amended National Programme?

All amended National Programmes submitted by Member States will be submitted to the STECF Expert Working Group 12-20 (December 2012). STECF will be responsible for deciding whether proposed amendments are minor or major and whether such amendments will have a positive or a negative impact on quality and coverage of the data. Based on this evaluation by the STECF, the Commission will decide whether amended National programmes require adoption by Commission Decision, based on whether the proposed amendments are minor or major and on the expects positive or negative impact on the data quality and coverage.

10 UPDATE OF GUIDELINES FOR AR SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION TEMPLATE

This chapter is organized as follows: General remarks are followed by specific remarks and comments on the AR guidelines and AR text. Then a summary on comments related to CV calculation and reporting is presented. Finally suggestions for improvement of the pre-screening process and template are listed. An amendment proposal for the evaluation template may be found in Annex V, biology and transversal and separated an economic suggestion, where module IV has not been updated yet. This list shall be understood as an open list in the sense that is it probably not complete and should be added. In particular section IV (Aquaculture and Processing) has not been dealt with in depth.

Guidelines for AR 2012 submission (updates): Text and tables

General:

The Group recognized that at EU and Regional level has been put considerable effort in harmonising naming and definitions of métiers as well as Region and fishing grounds, in accordance with Decision 949/2008 EC and the following 93/2010. Thereafter, the Group recommends all MS, in order to check discrepancies between texts and technical tables' samples, to ensure unambiguous documenting and coding of gears, métiers, fishing grounds etc… and to avoid fastidious and time consuming validation before tables' analysis, to follow strictly the Guidelines in terms of coding, naming conventions of métiers, regions, fishing grounds and species.

In the tables, CECAF, IOTC ICCAT etc. should be reported as "Other Regions" (see Appendix II EU Dec 93/2010) and then the different RFMO (i.e. CECAF, IOTC, WCPCF etc etc) and fishing ground should be specified. The same structure should be presented and reported in the text. Text and tables of the Annual Report must be comparable and must correspond!! Moreover, the Group recommends to use in the text the scientific names of the species (do not use the local name of the species!!!) in order to have homogeneity between countries and Region!!!

Some MS provided both achieved sample rate and response rate in case of a census, some did not. According to the AR guidelines, it does not have to be provided. Both versions make sense. For harmonisaton purposes it should be explicitly stated in the guidelines which version should be provided.

Relevant recommendations for MS to address: Now there is no overview of RCM/LM recommendations and it is difficult to evaluate. Recommendation: It is recommended that all countries list all RCM/LM recommendations that are put to MS. Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

Follow-up of STECF recommendations: not all member states used the format given in the template.

Recommendation: Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

Guideline text numbering of the sections should be changed. Currently it is misleading. The same number means different things in the guidelines text chapters and in the guidelines table names.

Replace references to "RCM" by "Liaison Meeting"

The evaluation template does basically refer to the tables, but does not directly address the AR text. The pre-screening template should also refer to information which is requested by the guidelines and has to be provided in the text. It would in general be helpful to have the template set up more like an exhaustive checklist of variables and information which has to be provided in either the text or the tables.

The National Program should contain an estimate of the number of vessels using the latest information available at the time of submission. MS should have a straightforward option to update these numbers without the obligation to go through the evaluation procedure.

It should be stressed in the guidelines that no cells should be deleted from the table and no columns should be added to insert comments. Comments should be listed at the end as footnote or an explanation should be given in the text of the AR.

MS should not plan sampling at a level submitted in their NP then change that planned number in the AR without agreement.

The planned number of trips/individuals provided in the NP and AR tables (identical columns) deviated in several cases, which should not be the case.

Specific:

Section I.

Add "methodological" to the paragraph:

Outline the general framework of the achieved national data collection programme in relation to the relevant version(s) of the DCF. Also mention which year of activities is covered by the Annual Report and whether there have been methodological major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before. MS should indicate in which section(s) these changes appear.

Add this sentence:

"In this section, MS should provide an <u>updated list of derogations</u>, including derogations added during the reference year, in the format of the NP proposal."

Section II.A

Add this sentence:

"Information on a <u>national DCF website</u> (ref. Commission Regulation (EC) 665/2008 art. 8(2)) should be given."

Section II.B.1

Add demand for using final reference list of eligible meetings distributed by Commission (Ref. MARE C3/IG/AK Ares(2011)1106663 of 18 Oct 2011; Ares(2011)1403088 of 22 Dec 2011).

Section II.B.2

delete 2nd paragraph

Add sentence: Only LM recommendations actioned in the reference year should be reported, e.g. in the AR2012, the LM 2011 recommendations are to be listed.

Section III.B

In the case that a variable is not applicable in a MS (e.g. income from fishing rights), it should not be left blank, but marked as "NA" in table III.B.3.

Requirements for the justification of clustering are unclear. NP tables contain indication of segment characteristics in terms of importance and similarity, but AR tables do not. On the other hand, AR text guidelines states:

"Clustering of fleet segments should be described and information should be given on the segments that are clustered, as required by the DCF and following STECF recommendations."

It is not consistent to request some indicator of importance in the NP and to request clustering information in the AR again. Instead, AR should request further information on clustering only in the case that the clustering scheme has changed compared to the NP.

III.B.2 –it should be clear that this table contains information on clustered segments. Information on clustering and on unclustered segments will be provided in table III.B.1 and III.B.3. This should be clarified in both the NP guidelines and the AR guidelines.

Concerning achieved sample rate in tables III.B.1 and III.B.3, table III.B.3 contains comprehensive information on sample and response rates by segment and variable while Table III.B.1 contains only one value per fleet segment. In case of different sampling schemes within a segment it is unclear which sample and response rates have to be provided in table III.B.1. E.g. income from landings is often derived from landings declarations which are available exhaustively, i.e. the sampling scheme is census while for the same fleet segment a questionnaire might be used to get cost data, and therefore the sampling scheme should be probability sampling. The latter sampling approach will have lower achieved sampling and response rates. The AR guidelines should be amended with respect to this issue. A solution might be to use a separate line for each sampling scheme per segment in table III.B.1.

Footnote a) in table III.B.3 is misleading because it excludes all variables from the capital value variable group. It should not exclude the value of quota and other fishing rights as these are not determined by the PIM method. The footnote on „capital value" in III.B.3 should also be contained in the guideline text. The guideline text should provide an overview on which variables are supposed to be included in table IIIB3 and which not

Tables IIIB1 and IIIB2 might be revised regarding the proposed changes in the templates. For the presentation of the fleet segment the dominant gear and the length class should be presented in

separate cells all over. The numbers from the NP should be contained in table III.B.1, not in III.B.2 only (as III.B2 only refers to clustered segments); the “number of vessels… from the most recent information” should be the same as the target population.

Guidelines chapter III.B.2: request for CV of observed values in case of non-probability sampling and census with response rate < 70% does not make much sense, as it does not give additional information as compared with CV of total estimates. The major concern in context of non-probability sampling and low response census is bias, and bias is not indicated by the CV of observed values. To be reviewed.

In the guidelines it is stated:

In case of derived indicators, as FTE, MS should provide the information about calculation procedures and accuracy indicators of based data collected. The data collected for this purpose should be stated in the report and accuracy indicators should be presented in Table III.B.3.

This paragraph should be clarified by a list of the derived indicators for which the calculation procedure is requested and a table providing a complete list of “based data” items and accuracy indicators of based data that should be presented. Moreover, this extra information should be provided in the AR text and not in the tables as DCF variables are already in the table and non DCF data should not be presented in the tables in any way.

Section III.C.1

Delete any references to "age".

Add column "RFMO" to field descriptions of all III.C tables (also in the Standard Table templates).

Section III.C.2

Replace "accuracy" with "precision"

Delete "/age" in the last sentence

Table III.C.5 should only report on length information, not age. To be clarified.

Codes for sampling frames should match exactly in Table III.C.3 and III.C.4.

Section III.D

Add a table to the guidelines and standard table templates allowing evaluation of MS achievement, reflecting sampling coverage (geographical, temporal), sampling intensity etc., looking similar as this:

MS	Year	Region	Species	Type of survey	

Section III.F

Concerning module F – transversal variables – it appeared that several MS did not appreciate the guidance in the Regulation. Table IIIF1 was left blank or each cell had " not relevant" or 'NA' when the MS considered their sampling achieved 100%. Table IIIF1 should be completed.

Section III.G.3

Add this sentence:

"All relevant Survey Planning Group recommendations should be listed, including responsive actions."

"If a survey had covered more than one type of activity, MS should insert separate lines for each type of activity."

Section IV

It should be stressed that table IV.A.1 has to provide the scientific names of the cultures species and that this table has to be filled in according to the guidelines, i.e. no cell should be left blank, possible answers are Yes, Yes (NS=no sampling) and No.

MS are asked to provide CV for a bundle of variables In case of the processing industry data from SBS shall be used. Then the following problem with accuracy and reliability concerning the SBS occurs:

> "The SBS Regulation is an output-oriented Regulation, leaving data providers the choice of data sources. In most countries a combination of survey and administrative data is used. It is very hard to assess the accuracy of the administrative data. No quantitative indicator is available."
>
> "For the data covered by survey the coefficients of variation have to be transmitted. Work is ongoing to calculate an overall EU coefficient of variation, but this is not available yet. **Data of individual countries cannot be published**."
>
> "The unit non-response and item non-response are provided by EEA Member States, but cannot be disseminated."
>
> (Source: http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_SDDS/EN/sbs_esms.htm)

If MS uses SBS, a description should be provided in their NP, based on the quality report of the National Statistical Office. This should include the collection scheme (Census/Probability sampling/stratified sampling/etc.), information about sampling and non-sampling errors etc. MS should be aware that mostly SBS is not a Census.

Concerning Table IV.A.2 and IV.B.1:

P in row J is a mistake. According to the guidelines text, division for archieved sample has to be made by frame population, and not by P (planned sample number).

Section V

For Table V_1 the template states 'for indicators 1-4 see III_G_1', but this table does not supply any information about the time lag for the data availability. This leads to inconsistency in the reported tables, as some MS incorporate indicators 1-4 in table V_1 and others don't. Recommendation: let all indicators be listed in table V_1.

Section VI.1

Add sentence: "Provide details on progress in national data management."

Comparison of achievements vs. NP for table VI_1 is difficult as most countries do not complete this table in the NP.

Data deficiencies: No MS was able to transmit all required data to ICES/JRC. The evaluation was only performed in relation to the data transmissions described in NP and the data transmission compliance reports from JRC/ICES have not been considered. Evaluation of achievements vs. NP for table VI_1 is difficult as most countries do not complete this table in NP. The level of detail of the ICES/JRC reports is less than provided by the assessment WG's, so no background is provided (e.g., too short time-series, incomplete datasets). Note: The evaluation this year is only done in relation to the NP data transmissions described.

Question in module VI "Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?" not always appropriate or relevant. For example, MS with no text on specific data management targets will be scored NA, whereas MS with text in NP proposal will be evaluated. Recommendation: in NP review clearly let targets be defined.

Section VII

Review of STECF/LM recommendations:

- Difficult to judge: no complete list of recommendations to evaluate against.
- Review of recommendations: MS should state explicitly if there are no relevant recommendations to address.
- III.G.3 recommendations: there were no 2010 survey recommendations except for the RGMMed&BS

Recommendation: Provide each MS with a template where all recommendations are listed prior to AR (might be a tool from the database).

On CV

The calculation of CV appears to be unclear. It is strongly recommended to update the AR guidelines in this context (sampling size correction, see below, from pre-screening group comments). Clarification that CV is not useful for debt/asset ratio or derived variables.

Guidelines, page 11 f.

$CV(\hat{Y}) = \sigma(\hat{Y})/\hat{Y}$

where:

$\hat{\sigma}(\hat{Y})$ is the estimate standard deviation of $\hat{Y}$
$\hat{Y}$ is the estimated total value (per fleet segment) of the variable e.g. total energy costs

When only a sample of data from a population is available, the population CV can be estimated using the ratio of the sample standard deviation s to the sample mean $\bar{x}$:

$$\hat{c}_v = \frac{s}{\bar{x}}$$

But this estimator, when applied to a small or moderately sized sample, tends to be too low: it is a biased estimator. For normally distributed data, an unbiased estimator for a sample of size n is:

$$\hat{c}_v^* = \left(1 + \frac{1}{4n}\right)\hat{c}_v$$

If it is assumed that the data are log-normally distributed, a more accurate estimate, derived from the properties of the log-normal distribution, is defined as:

$$\hat{c}_{v\ln} = \sqrt{e^{s_{\ln}^2} - 1}$$

where $s_{\ln}$ is the sample standard deviation of the data after a natural log transformation.

Calculation and Reporting of CV's

One of the most common issues across all member states was the recurring question of the calculation and reporting of CV's.

Reviewing all MS programs concerning the calculation of CV on the stock related parameters, the following can be concluded and highlighted:

The present requirements (i.e. reporting of the CV values) have resulted in some problems. CV are to be reported for variables that are not been asked for by main end-users, MS have difficulties in reporting CV and it is universally agreed that the current precision levels are unrealistic and irrelevant, as they are only used for the DCF Annual Report. The end users of the data should be consulted during the review process currently underway for the new framework, on what would be their preferred options regarding the evaluation of data quality.

In general, the effort input by MS in calculating CVs has increased. However, some MS have not calculated CV for any or some of the parameters using the explanation that the tool for calculating CV, COST (Common Open Source Tool), is not fully developed. This explanation is not considered valid, while the requirement to estimate and report CV is clearly stated in the regulation. The methodology used for calculation of CV has to be described in the Annual Report, but only a few MS have included a description. In order to be able to evaluate the relevance of the actual CV values a description of method used must be included.

The COST project was intended to be the tool for managing the CV calculation for all parameters, to be used by all MS. Since the project ended, no support, no further development or remaining bugs have been corrected which makes the tool incomplete. This has of course, caused some problems for several MS, while other MS have started to develop separate scripts for the CV calculation.

The EWG recommends that new methods of reporting quality indicators for sampling programmes are adopted in the new framework.

Evaluation of the quality of the data – inclusion of alternative quality indicators

It is further important to realize that CVs is not a “standalone” indicator of data quality. Even if data is precise it could be corrupted by bias. To be able to estimate CVs in a correct way, statistically sound sampling schemes need to be designed. The quality assurance of designs including establishment of methods for representative sampling, requirements for documentation and development of quality indicators should be the priority. WKPICS 1-3 will be dealing with the design of statistically sound sampling designs and should be considered as a good reference for the formation of sampling guidelines in the new framework.

Such schemes could be evaluated by the STECF-EWG and constitute an indicator of quality. In such schemes it needs to be evaluated what part of the population is accessible for sampling (which could be another indicator) and if the parts not accessible differ, from the sampled population, in for example, spatial fishing pattern (which could be another indicator). Age readings are another element which can also introduce bias. It is therefore important that MS on a routine basis, work with quality assurance and that new staff get sufficient training before starting age reading on a routine basis. Existence of protocols (that could be evaluated by STECF-EWG) on quality control and follow up for age readings within a MS could be a quality indicator as well as percentage agreement in the actual age readings. EWG 12 – 08 believes the quality aspects would improve considerably if alternative quality indicators were considered in the new DCF.

Pre-screening and evaluation process:

Provide guidelines or suggestions for pre-screeners in order to ensure consistency across the evaluations. Evaluators should all have the same understanding for answering the questions in the evaluation sheets, e.g. in the sections on regional co-ordination, the answer to the question "*Were the relevant derogations listed?*" should be "NA" (not applicable) if there are no relevant derogations at all

(instead of "No"). No - Should be taken to mean that derogations were requested in the NP, but are not present in the AR

In the comments cells, formulations such as "*MS should revise…*" should be avoided (only in case of unclear wording by MS in the AR text or tables), and instead, only facts about outstanding or erroneous information be stated. It is up to STECF to recommend MS amendments and up to the Commission to decide upon forwarding these recommendations to MS.

Encourage comments from the pre-screening, as it helps in the final evaluation. A list of "frequently applied comments" would be helpful for standardization, like:

- Names of segments and supra regions should be those stated in the regulation.
- Clustered segments should be signaled by an asterisk in table III.B.1
- Achieved sample rate is not appropriate for census, response rate should be given instead.
- Clustered segment should take the name of the largest segment in the cluster
- When response rate of census <70% other variability indicators should be provided in addition to CV.
- CV value cannot be the same for all variables
- Capital value, capital costs and transversal variables should not be reported in this table. Transversal variables have to be shown in table III.F.1
- Variables were not provided in NP and therefore cannot be compared
- No recommendations on economic variables were issued by LM 2010, previous recommendations already included in guidelines.

Reporting in the template should be completed in a consistent fashion. Not all the transversal variable prescreening cells were filled out. Pre – screeners are requested to ensure that the pre – screening template is complete for all Member States.

Regions in biological modules C and E in the template should reflect the separation of regions in the Annual Report, and be assessed separately to allow for a thorough evaluation.

It is suggested that the pre – screening group, have an initial meeting (via WebEx) to agree a consistent approach to these issues.

The overview table on MS performance should be constructed by region.

Questions like "Is Table XY complete and consistent with AR guidelines? "should be split two, i.e., complete and consistent.

Suggestion: drop-down box for standard answer/comments options → consistency

Possibility to evaluate the full NP period in the same file, including the 2011 evaluation → it will be possible to see progress

Suggest question for section I: *Is the relevant DCF legislation cited? Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned? Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in approach compared to the year(s) before?*

Sometimes we found "mistakes", but they are not declared as "deviations". In these cases we would always have to state "deviations are not justified" – that makes little sense. Same with "actions to avoid shortfalls in the future": the errors that we find are usually not mentioned by the MS.

Identification of shortfalls: MS sometimes do not address apparent shortfalls. How to evaluate? Against the MS opinion or against the opinion of the experts? This group chose for the latter option.

It is sometimes hard to identify shortfalls without specific information on the country's sampling

•

ANNEX I BENCHMARK EXAMPLES PER MODULE OF AR

Module	Country
I (General Framework)	Belgium, Poland
II (National data Collection Organisation)	Denmark, Netherlands
III	
IIIA (Description of the Fishing Sector)	Netherlands, Portugal, UK
IIIB (Economic Variables)	
IIIC (Biological Métier Related Variables)	Sweden, Germany, Cyprus
IIID (Recreational Fisheries)	Denmark, Finland
IIIE (Biological Stock Related Variables)	UK
IIIF (Transversal Variables)	Netherlands
IIIG (Research Vessels at sea)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands
IV (Economics – Aquaculture and Processing)	Germany and Latvia
V (Ecosystem Indicators)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands
VI (Management of Data)	Germany, Ireland, Netherlands

Guidelines for the amendment of National Programmes 2011-13 for the year 2013

July 2012

Background

The DCF National Programmes (NP) 2011-13 were submitted by Member States in 2010 (deadline 31 March 2010).

Member States who wished to amend their NP2011-13 for 2012 and/or 2013 had until 31 October 2011 to submit their proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 to the Commission. The proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 were evaluated by STECF Expert Working Group (EWG) 11-19 which met from 28 November to 1 December 2011. This EWG identified a number of problems with the evaluation process and made recommendations to improve it for future amendments to the NPs. The EWG's comments and recommendations were reviewed by the 39th Meeting of the STECF Plenary (Plen-12-01) that met from 16-20 April 2012.

By 31 October 2012, Member States who wished to amend their NP2011-13 for 2013 must submit their proposed amendments to the NP2011-13 to the Commission. The following guidelines are designed to help member States determine whether or not they should submit amendments to their NP2011-13 for the year 2013, and if so, how to do so to facilitate the EWG's subsequent evaluation of the proposed amendments. The present guidelines for the amendment of NPs were reviewed by STECF EWG12-08 in June 2012. They complement the *Guidelines for the submission of National Programmes 2011-2013* that were published in 2009.

1. What amendments require resubmission of the National Programme?

1.1. Amendments that require submission of the amended NP to the Commission

Member States wishing to make the following type of amendment to their National Programme for the year 2013 **should submit their proposed amended National Programme** to the Commission:

- Addition/removal of surveys or pilot studies.

- Modification of surveys or pilot studies that have an effect on the temporal aspects (continuity of survey series), spatial aspects (coverage), technical aspects (change in gear, technology) or financial aspects of the National Programme.

- A modification in sampling design or any other change in methodology e.g. a change from probability to non-probability sampling.

- A request for a derogation.

- A decrease of sampling sizes

In their amended National Programme, Member States should provide a justification for each proposed amendment and a description of the impact this will have on the data quality and coverage.

1.2. Amendments that do not require submission of the amended NP to the Commission

Member States making the following type of amendment to their National Programme **do not need to submit their proposed amended National Programme** to the Commission:

- Modification of surveys or pilot studies that do not have an effect on the temporal aspects (continuity of survey series), spatial aspects (coverage), technical aspects (change in gear, technology) or financial aspects of the National Programme.

- Updated description of the fishing or aquaculture or processing sector (e.g. number of enterprises in the population) or of the institutional set up for the DCF (e.g. changes in the role or task sharing between institutes).

- Updated or more detailed description of a methodology used (as long as these do not involve a change in methodology).

- Updated list of recommendations by STECF/RCMs etc. or follow-up actions such as changes to métier naming conventions that were agreed in an RCM.

- Updated list of eligible meetings.

- Addition or deletion of a bilateral or multilateral agreement.

- An increase of sampling sizes

- Regarding **Reference Years**, MS can choose whether or not to update the **reference years** in the text and tables of the amended NP. If a Member State updates the reference years, they do not need to resubmit their amended National Programme to the Commission, but should report on this in their Annual Report.

Note that the list under section 1.1. above is not comprehensive but aims to provide an indication of the type of changes considered to be important enough to require submission of the amended National

programme to the Commission. **Member States are invited to contact the Commission in case of doubt regarding whether to resubmit their amended National Programme**.

2. How should the amended National Programme be presented?

- Member States should resubmit the full programme (word file and excel file with ALL tables) and **highlight the modifications** in track changes in the word file and in a different colour in the tables. Moreover, Member States should ensure that their Tables only contain the coloured text that indicates proposed amendments (i.e. Tables should not contain any other national colour-coding, highlighted text or coloured cells). Also, Member States should refrain from adding national comments alongside the standard tables.

-On the front page of the amended National Programme (word file) please indicate, in track changes, the **date** at which the amended document was prepared.

e.g. Belgian National Programme 2011-2013

Revision for year 2013

15 October 2012

- After the front page of the NP (word file), Member States should include a section (of 1-2 pages**) summarising the proposed amendments** to the programme.

- Member States should not delete **information relating to previous years** as the amended National programme should still reflect the work that was planned for the whole period 2011-2013 (i.e. NPs should not provide information solely on the year 2013). E.g. Member States should not delete RCM/STECF or other recommendations from previous years that the Member State has already acted upon.

-If proposed amendments are based on **bilateral or multilateral agreements**, Member States should include the agreement as an annex.

- If **derogation** is requested, Member States should note this clearly and include a justification for the request and information on the likely impact this would have on data availability and quality.

- For any amendment, Member States should **provide a justification** and in addition, if proposed amendments (including requests for derogations) were discussed at an RCM, member States should include **relevant information from that RCM,** e.g. what is the importance of the métier in the regional view? Has the RCM concluded that sampling is well covered by other countries? This kind of

information is usually compiled in the RCM reports, and should be included in the NP proposal allowing the EWG to judge the potential consequences of a derogation or an amendment.

- If a **change in methodology** is proposed, Member States should provide details about the proposed changes or the proposed new methodology to be followed.

- Member States are reminded to **follow the *Guidelines*** *for the submission of National Programmes 2011-2013 e.g.* Member States should use scientific species names throughout the Programme.

3. Which changes will require adoption by the Commission of the amended National Programme?

All amended National Programmes submitted by Member States will be submitted to the STECF Expert Working Group 12-20 (December 2012). STECF will be responsible for deciding whether proposed amendments are minor or major and whether such amendments will have a positive or a negative impact on quality and coverage of the data. Based on this evaluation by the STECF, the Commission will decide whether amended National programmes require adoption by Commission Decision, based on whether the proposed amendments are minor or major and on the expects positive or negative impact on the data quality and coverage.

ANNEX III SCHEME OF EVALUATION TEMPLATE USED BY PRE-SCREENERS AND EWG 12-08

Member State:	**Template**		
	Reference year	2011	
	Version of the AR reviewed		
	Version of the NP proposal		
		Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
	Overall compliance		
I	**General framework**		
II	**National data collection organisation**		
A	**National correspondent and participating institutes**		
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?	(cells in grey can be filled in advance of the EWG evaluation meeting)	
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?		
B	**Regional and International coordination**		
B1	**Attendance of international meetings**		
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?		
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?		
B2	**Follow-up of regional and international recommendations**		
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
SUPRA-REGION XXXX			
III	**Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector**		
A	**General description of the fishing sector**		
	Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		
B	**Economic variables**		

Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	

B1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

C Biological métier related variables

C1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

C2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	

	Were CV targets met?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
	Are the responsive actions described?	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
North Atlantic		
C	**Biological métier related variables**	
C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**	
	Were CV estimates provided?	
	Were CV targets met?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**	
	Were the relevant derogations listed?	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	

Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

C4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

D Recreational fisheries

D1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are obtained derogations mentioned?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

D2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were data quality targets provided?	
Were data quality targets met?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

D3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

North Sea & Eastern Arctic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	
Were CV targets met?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

North Atlantic

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?	
Were CV targets met?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Were the relevant derogations listed?	
Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	

			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
F	**Transversal variables**			
			Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	F1	**Capacity**		
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
	F2	**Effort**		
		F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
			Are the responsive actions described?	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
	F3	**Landings**		

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

F12 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

F13 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	
Are the responsive actions acceptable?	

F14 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

G Research surveys at sea

G1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	
Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	

G2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	
Are the deviations explained?	
Are the deviations justified?	

G3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
Are the responsive actions described?	

	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
G4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
IV	**Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry**	
A	**Collection of data concerning the aquaculture**	
	Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?	
	Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
A1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
A2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Is respective data quality information given?	
	Are the deviations explained?	
	Are the deviations justified?	
A3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
	Are the responsive actions described?	
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
A4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
B	**Collection of data concerning the processing industry**	
	Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	

Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

B2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

V Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Were the relevant derogations listed?		

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

VI Module for management and use of the data

1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table VI.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Are the "Transmission of data" achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
Is progress in the "Management of data" section well detailed?		
Is information on a national DCF website provided (if not in section II.A) ?		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

2 Actions to avoid shortfalls

	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
	Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
	Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?		
IX	**IX. Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
	Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?		
X	**X. References**		
	Is there a complete list of references?		
XI	**XI. Annexes**		
	Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?		

Compliance class	Compliance level
No	<10%
Partly	10-50%
Mostly	50-90%
Yes	>90%
NA	not applicable

ANNEX IV REVIEW OF MEMBER STATES ANNUAL REPORTS – RESULTS

Module	BEL	BUL	CYP	DEN	EST	FIN	FRC	GER	GRE[x]	IRL	ITA	LAT	LIT	MAL	NLD	POL	POR	ROM	SLO	SPA	SWE	UK
OVERALL COMPLIANCE	P	P	M	M	M	M	M	Y		M	M	M	P	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Module I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		M	Y	**P**	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M
Module II	M	**P**	**P**	Y	M	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M
IIIA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	**P**	**P**	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
IIIC	M	**P**	Y	M	M	M	M	Y		M	M	Y	M	Y	M	M	M	Y	M	M	M	M
IIID	M	NA	NA	Y	Y	Y	M	Y		M	Y	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y	**P**	NA	NA	Y	Y	M
IIIE	**P**	**P**	M	M	**P**	Y	M	M		M	M	M	**P**	**P**	M	M	M	M	Y	M	M	Y
IIIF	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y	M	Y		Y	M	M	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	M
IIIG	Y	**P**	M	M	Y	M	M	Y		M	M	Y	Y	M	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	M	Y
Module Vmodule VI	M	M	**P**	Y	**P**	M	Y	Y		Y	M	M	**P**	**P**	Y	**P**	**P**	M	**P**	M	Y	M
III B (Fleet Econ.)	M	**P**	M	Y	M	M	M	Y		M	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	M	M	M	M
Module IV Aqua	N	M	Y	Y	Y	Y	M	Y		Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	Y
Module IV B (Processing)	**P**	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	Y		Y	M	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	M	Y	M	M	M
Module VII	**P**	N	**P**	N	**P**	Y	M	Y		Y	Y	**P**	**P**	Y	Y	M	M	Y	M	Y	Y	**P**

x Note that Greece has not provided an Annual Report

Compliance level	
No <10%	N
Partly 10-50%	**P**
Mostly 50-90%	M
Yes >90%	Y
NA = not applicable	**NA**

Member State:				Compliance class	Compliance level
	Reference year			No	<10%
	Version of the AR reviewed			Partly	10-50%
	Version of the NP proposal			Mostly	50-90%
		Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**	Yes	>90%
	Overall compliance			NA	not applicable
I General framework	Is the relevant DCF legislation cited?				
	Is the year of activities covered by the AR mentioned?				
	Is there any information provided if there have been major changes in the methodological approach compared to the year(s) before?				
	Is there an updated list of derogations?				
II National data collection organisation					
A National correspondent and participating institutes					
	Are the partners involved in the national data collection and their roles well described?				
	Is there an overview and description of contents of national coordination meetings?				
	Is information on a national DCF website provided?				
B Regional and International coordination					
B1 Attendance of international meetings					
	Is Table II.B.1 complete?				
	Are the reasons for non-attendance at planned meetings explained?				
B2 Follow-up of regional and international recommendations					
	Are the general recommendations from Liaison Meeting listed?				
	Are the responsive actions described?				

Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

SUPRA-REGION XXXX

III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

A General description of the fishing sector

Are changes in the fishing sector (if any) and their impact on the NP implementation well described?		

B Economic variables

Is the population in Table III.B.1 updated with the current fleet register data?		For this comparison the pre-screener should receive the relevant fleet register information from the Commission.
Is the total number of vessels in Table III.B.1, column I (Number of vessels in the segment from the most recent information) similar (~10%) to the total provided in the fleet register?		
Are all mandatory cells in Table III.B.1 filled in?		
Are all columns filled in accordance with the format from the AR guidelines?		
- Are supraregions named correctly ?		
- Are clustered segments marked * ?		
- Are clustered segments presented under the cluster name from Table III.B.2, column D?		
- Are all segments consistent with NP?		
- Is the reference year correct?		
-Is frame population smaller or equal to target population?		
Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR		

		guidelines?	
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is the planned sample number in the AR Table III.B.1 similar to the number in the NP (<20% difference)?	If the difference is bigger than 20%, some closer look at the data might be advisable
		Is the Achieved Sample no. / Planned sampled no. in the AR Table III.B.1 above 10%?	10% is to be regarded as preliminary threshold; if the ratio is very low, MS should comment on this issue in the AR text
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
		Are the responsive actions described?	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	

REGION XXX

C **Biological métier related variables**

C1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
		Is Table III.C.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is Table III.C.4 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	

	Is Table III.C.5 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Is Table III.C.6 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
C2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were CV estimates provided?		
	Were CV targets met?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
C3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
C4	**Actions to avoid shortfalls**		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION XXX

D	**Recreational fisheries**		
D1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are obtained derogations mentioned?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
	Were data quality estimates provided?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
D3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

D4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

REGION XXX

E Biological stock-related variables

E1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is Table III.E.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

E2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Were CV estimates provided?		
Were CV targets met?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

E3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

E4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

F Transversal variables

Is Table III.F.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		

F1 Capacity

F11 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
		Are the deviations explained?		
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?		
		Are the deviations explained?		
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F13	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
F2	**Effort**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
		Are the deviations explained?		
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Is respective data quality information given?		
		Are the deviations explained?		
		Are the deviations justified?		
	F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
		Are the responsive actions described?		
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
	F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		
F3	**Landings**			
	F11	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		

			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F12	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
			Is respective data quality information given?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
		F13	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
			Are the responsive actions described?	
			Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
		F14	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
			Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
G	**Research surveys at sea**			
	G1	**Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is Table III.G.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
			Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
			Is there a map of the survey with achieved sampling activities?	
	G2	**Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal**		
			Is the quality of the survey indices likely to be kept (by e.g. no change in gear settings, sufficient geographical coverage etc.)?	
			Are the deviations explained?	
			Are the deviations justified?	
	G3	**Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations**		
			Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
			Are the relevant recommendations by Survey Planning Groups listed?	

Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

G4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		

		Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
	B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
	B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is respective data quality information given?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
	B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations	
		Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?	
		Are the responsive actions described?	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
	B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
V	**Module of evaluation of the effects of the fishing sector on the marine ecosystem**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table V.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
	2	Actions to avoid shortfalls	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
VI	**Module for management and use of the data**		
	1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal	
		Is Table VI.1 consistent with AR guidelines?	
		Is progress in the "data management" section well detailed?	

		Are the achievements in the "data management" section consistent with the NP proposal?	
		Are the deviations explained?	
		Are the deviations justified?	
	2 Actions to avoid shortfalls		
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?	
		Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?	
VII	**Follow-up of STECF recommendations**		
		Are the relevant STECF recommendations listed?	
		Are the responsive actions described?	
		Are the responsive actions acceptable?	
VIII	**List of acronyms and abbreviations**		
		Is there a list of acronyms and abbreviations?	
IX	**Comments, suggestions and reflections**		
		Are there any comments, suggestions and/or reflections?	
X	**References**		
		Is there a complete list of references?	
XI	**Annexes**		
		Do the provided annexes contain the relevant information to support statements made in the main text?	

Economic proposal for template

Member State:		
Reference year	2011	
Version of the AR reviewed	Version 3 of 31 May 2012	
Version of the NP proposal	"April-May 2010"	
	Answer	**EWG COMMENTS**
Overall compliance		

I General framework

SUPRA-REGION XXXX

Green cells specify issues for which a preparatory check could be performed automatically by an (Excel) query (to be developed)

III Module of the evaluation of the fishing sector

B Economic variables

	Judgement	evaluation comments	explanation
Is Table III.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?			
Is the total of the target population in table III_B_1 similar (~10%) to the total provided in the fleet register?			For this comparison the pre-screener should receive the relevant fleet register information from the Commission.
Are all mandatory cells in Table III-B1 filled in?			

Are all columns filled in accordance with the format requested in the AR guidelines?			This issue is specified by the following questions
- Are supraregions named correctly ?			
- Are segments named correctly ?			
- Are clustered segments marked * ?			
- Are clustered segments presented under the cluster name from IIIB2, column D?			

- Is the reference year correct?		
-Is frame population smaller or equal to target population?		

Is Table III.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	

Are all columns filled in accordance with the format requested in the AR guidelines?			This issue is specified by the following questions
- Is the cluster named after the largest fleet segment?			
- Are supraregions named correctly ?			
- Are clustered segments marked * ?			
- Is the reference year correct?			

Is Table III.B.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?	

Are all columns filled in accordance with the format requested in the AR guidelines?			This issue is specified by the following questions
- Are supraregions named correctly ?			
- Are segments presented as unclustered?			
- Is the reference year correct?			
- Are all requested variables listed - and only the requested ones?			
- Is the achieved sample rate provided for all variables? (not for census)			
- Is the response rate provided for all variables?			
- Is CV provided? (not for census with response rate above 70%)			

B1 ~~Achievements:~~ Results and consistency with NP proposal

Are design and achievements consistent with the NP proposal?			This issue is specified by the following questions
- Is the list of segments consistent with NP?			
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?			
- Is the clustering scheme consistent with NP?			

In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
- Is the sampling strategy consistent with NP?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
- Is the planned sample number in the AR table III_B_1 similar to the number in the NP (<20% difference)?		If the difference is bigger than 20% some closer look at the data might be advisable
In case of major difference: has MS addressed this issue in the AR text?		
- Is the Achieved Sample no. / Planned sampled no. in the AR table III_B_1 above 10%?		10% is to be regarded as preliminary threshold; if the ratio is very low, MS should comment on this issue in the AR text
In case of major difference: has MS addressed this issue in the AR text?		

~~Are the deviations explained?~~
~~Are the deviations justified?~~

B2 ~~Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal~~

~~Is respective data quality information given?~~
~~Are the deviations explained?~~
~~Are the deviations justified?~~

B1b Further specifications: Is the AR text complete and consistent with AR guidelines?

In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		
In case of deviations: has MS explained this issue in the AR text?		

B3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

This refers only to the shortfalls which are mentioned by the MS; any other shortfalls which have been identified during the evaluation are to be addressed in previous sections

B4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

This has not been updated yet!

IV Module of the evaluation of the economic situation of the aquaculture and processing industry

A Collection of data concerning the aquaculture

Is AR consistent with table IV.A.1?		
Is Table IV.A.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
Is Table IV.A.3 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		

A1 Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

A2 Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal

Is respective data quality information given?		
Are the deviations explained?		
Are the deviations justified?		

A3 Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations

Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
Are the responsive actions described?		
Are the responsive actions acceptable?		

A4 Actions to avoid shortfalls

Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

This has not been updated yet!

B Collection of data concerning the processing industry

Is Table IV.B.1 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		

	Is Table IV.B.2 complete and consistent with AR guidelines?		
B1	Achievements: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Are the achievements consistent with the NP proposal?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
B2	Data quality: Results and deviation from NP proposal		
	Is respective data quality information given?		
	Are the deviations explained?		
	Are the deviations justified?		
B3	Follow-up of Regional and international recommendations		
	Are the relevant recommendations from LM listed?		
	Are the responsive actions described?		
	Are the responsive actions acceptable?		
B4	Actions to avoid shortfalls		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future described?		
	Are actions to avoid shortfalls in the future acceptable?		

ANNEX VI EWG-12-08 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

STECF member			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Christoph STRANSKY	vTI Institute of Sea Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 HAMBURG Germany	Tel +494038905228	christoph.stransky@vti.bund.de

Invited experts			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Angeliki ADAMIDOU	NAGREF_Fisheries Research Institute Nea Peramos 64007 KAVALA Greece	Tel +302594021273	adamidou@inale.gr
Angeles ARMESTO	Instituto Español de Oceanografia, Cabo Estay-Canido, 36200, Vigo, Spain	Tel +34986492111	angeles.armesto@vi.ieo.es
Margaret BELL	Fisheries Research Services Marine Laboratory, 375 Victoria Rd, AB11 9DB, Aberdeen, United Kingdom	Tel +441224876544	bellma@marlab.ac.uk
Jörg BERKENHAGEN	vTI Institute of Sea Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 HAMBURG Germany	Tel +4904038905206	joerg.berkenhagen@vti.bund.de
Cecile BRIGAUDEAU	Des requins et de Hommes, Impasse Kerjacob, 29810, lampaul-plouarzel, France		cecile@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Paolo CARPENTIERI	MIPAF Viale dell'Universitá 32 ROME Italy	Tel +390649914763	paolo.carpentieri@uniroma1.it
Irina DAVIDJUKA	Fish Resources Research Department Daugavgrivas 8 LV-1048 RIGA Latvia	Tel +371 67617527 Fax +371 67616946	irina.davidjuka@bior.gov.lv
Ingeborg DE BOOIS	IMARES, P.O. Box 68, 1970 AB, IJmuiden, The Netherlands	Tel +31317487070	ingeborg.deboois@wur.nl
Henrik DEGEL	Danish Fisheries Research Institute, Charlottenlund Slot, 2920, Charlottenlund, Denmark	Tel 4533963386	hd@difres.dk
Marina DIAS	IPIMAR - National Laboratory of Marine Research, Av. Brasilia, 1449-	Tel +351213027185	mdias@ipimar.pt

	006, Lisboa, Portugal		
Christian DINTHEER	IFREMER Rue de l'Ile d'Yeu BP 21105 44311 NANTES France	Tel +330240374000 Fax +330240374213	christian.dintheer@ifremer.fr
Michael W. EBELING	Institute for Seafishery Palmaille 9 22767 HAMBURG Germany	Tel +494038905186	Michael.Ebeling@vti.bund.de
Monica GAMBINO	IREPA Onlus, via S. Leonardo, trav. Migliaro, 84113, Salerno, Italy	Tel +39089338978	gambino@irepa.org
Leyre GOTI	vTI Institute of Sea Fisheries Palmaille 9 22767 HAMBURG Germany	Tel +4904038905107	leyre.goti@vti.bund.de
Maria HANSSON	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Turistgatan 5, 453 30, Lysekil, Sweden	Tel +4604784020	maria.hansson@slu.se
Armelle JUNG	Des requins et de Hommes, Impasse Kerjacob, 29810, lampaul-plouarzel, France		armelle@desrequinsetdeshommes.org
Carlos MOURA	DGPA - Directio Geral das Pescas e Aquicultura Av. de Brasilia 1449-030 LISBOA Portugal		cmoura@dgpa.min-agricultura.pt
Tomasz NERMER	The Sea Fisheries Institute in Gdynia, Kollataja 1, 81-332, Gdynia, Poland	Tel 48587356211	nermer@mir.gdynia.pl
Gráinne NÍ CHONCHÚIR	The Marine Institute, Rinville, Oranmore, Co. Galway, Ireland	Tel 35391387200	grainne.nichonchuir@marine.ie
Jukka PÖNNI	Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute, Sapokankatu 2, 48100, Kotka, Finland	Tel +358205751894	jukka.ponni@rktl.fi
Gheorghe RADU	NIMRD Grigore Antipa Constanta Mamaia 300 900581 CONSTANTA Romania	Tel +40241543288 Fax +40241831274	gpr@alpha.rmri.ro
Tiit RAID	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu		tiit.raid@gmail.com
Pieter-Jan SCHÖN	Agri-Food & Biosciences Institute, Newforge Lane, BT9 5PX,	Tel +442890255015	pieter-jan.schon@afbini.gov.uk

	Belfast, United Kingdom		
Constantin STROIE	National Agency for Fisheries and Aquaculture 54, Eufrosina Popescu Str. 75436 BUCHAREST Romania	Tel +4074537711	cststroie@yahoo.com
Jens ULLEWEIT	Institute for Seafishery Palmaille 9 22767 HAMBURG Germany	Tel +494038905217	jens.ulleweit@vti.bund.de
Maria YANKOVA	Institute of Fishing Resources, Blvd. Primorski 4, 9000, Varna, Bulgaria		maria_y@abv.bg

European Commission			
DG MARE			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	Email
Amelie KNAPP	European Commission rue Joseph II, 79 B-1000 BRUSSELS Belgium	Tel +3222978727	amelie.knapp@ec.europa.eu
Herwig RANNER	European Commission rue Joseph II, 79 B-1000 BRUSSELS Belgium	Tel +3222999805 Fax +3222950774	herwig.ranner@ec.europa.eu
STECF Secretariat			
Name	Address	Telephone no.	
Hendrik DOERNER	European Commission - Joint Research Centre IPSC Maritime Affairs Unit (TP 051) Via E.Fermi, 2749 I - 21027 Ispra (VA) Italy	Tel +390332789343 Fax +390332789658	hendrik.doerner@jrc.ec.europa.eu
Nikolaos MITRAKIS	European Commission - Joint Research Centre IPSC Maritime Affairs Unit (TP 051) Via E.Fermi, 2749 I - 21027 Ispra (VA) Italy	Tel +390332786479 Fax +390332789658	nikolaos.mitrakis@jrc.ec.europa.eu

LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background documents are published on the meeting's web site on:
http://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/web/stecf/ewg08

List of background documents:

1. EWG-12-08 – Doc 1 - Declarations of invited and JRC experts.

European Commission

EUR 25450 EN – Joint Research Centre – Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen

Title: Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries. Evaluation of MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF (STECF-OWP-12-05).

STECF members: Casey, J., Abella, J. A., Andersen, J., Bailey, N., Bertignac, M., Cardinale, M., Curtis, H., Daskalov, G., Delaney, A., Döring, R., Garcia Rodriguez, M., Gascuel, D., Graham, N., Gustavsson, T., Jennings, S., Kenny, A., Kirkegaard, E., Kraak, S., Kuikka, S., Malvarosa, L., Martin, P., Motova, A., Murua, H., Nord, J., Nowakowski, P., Prellezo, R., Sala, A., Scarcella, G., Simmonds, J., Somarakis, S., Stransky, C., Theret, F., Ulrich, C., Vanhee, W. & Van Oostenbrugge, H.

EWG-12-08 members: Ebeling, M. W., Adamidou A., Armesto A., Bell M., Berkenhagen J., Brigaudeau C., Carpentieri P., Davidjuka I., De Boois I., Degel H., Dias M., Dintheer C., Gambino M., Goti L., Hansson M., Jung A., Moura C., Nermer T., Ní Chonchúir G., Pönni J., Radu G., Raid T., Schön P-J., Stroie C., Ulleweit J., Yankova M.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

2012 – 239 pp. – 21 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1831-9424 (online), ISSN 1018-5593 (print)

ISBN 978-92-79-25748-3

doi:10.2788/39974

Abstract

The Expert Working Group meeting of the Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries EWG 12-08 was held from 25 – 29 June in Hamburg, Germany, to evaluate MS Annual Reports for 2011 of the DCF. The EWG report was reviewed by written procedure in July 2012.

How to obtain EU publications

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (http://bookshop.europa.eu), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

LB-NA-25450-EN-N

As the Commission's in-house science service, the Joint Research Centre's mission is to provide EU policies with independent, evidence-based scientific and technical support throughout the whole policy cycle.

Working in close cooperation with policy Directorates-General, the JRC addresses key societal challenges while stimulating innovation through developing new standards, methods and tools, and sharing and transferring its know-how to the Member States and international community.

Key policy areas include: environment and climate change; energy and transport; agriculture and food security; health and consumer protection; information society and digital agenda; safety and security including nuclear; all supported through a cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary approach.

The Scientific, Technical and Economic Committee for Fisheries (STECF) has been established by the European Commission. The STECF is being consulted at regular intervals on matters pertaining to the conservation and management of living aquatic resources, including biological, economic, environmental, social and technical considerations.

Publications Office

ISBN 978-92-79-25748-3

9 789279 257483